

MODERN PHILOLOGY

VOLUME XXXIII

February 1936

NUMBER 3

BY WHAT ROUTE DID THE ROMANTIC TRADITION OF ARTHUR REACH THE FRENCH?

ROGER S. LOOMIS

IN *Celtic myth and Arthurian romance* (New York, 1927) I set forth a hypothesis of the origins and transmission of the Round Table cycle which succeeding years of investigation have convinced me was, in the main, sound, and these pages constitute an attempt to clarify and amplify the matter. In order that I may come to the point without undue delay, let me assume that the cradle of that great romantic tradition does not lie among the ruins of the temple of Zeus at Dodona or in the palace of Agamemnon at Mycenae or on some mountain peak in Persia.¹ After all, we are not on the road to Xanadu, but to Caerleon on Usk. Let me also assume that neither Geoffrey of Monmouth nor Chrétien de Troyes was the "father of Arthurian romance" in the sense that he first created or popularized the fantastic story-patterns characteristic of that cycle.² The number of Celtic parallels pointed out in the course of the last fifty years justifies our starting with the further premise that not only was Arthur himself an acknowledged hero of the Celts but also a considerable and fundamental part of his legend was Celtic. These issues, alas, are still under debate, but it is not out of dogmatism that I here exclude them from discussion. One cannot cover all phases of the Arthurian problem in one article, and the assumptions with which I start are, I believe, the conclusions of a majority of those who have made a close study of the

¹ Cf. C. B. Lewis, *Classical mythology and Arthurian romance* (London, 1932); F. von Suhtscheck, *Forschungen und Fortschritte*, VII (1931), 134; *Klio*, XXV (1931), 50.

² *Speculum*, III (1928), 16.

subject, surely a majority of those scholars who combine a knowledge of Arthurian romance with some knowledge of Celtic literature. So, postulating that the original part of the narrative elements in legends of the Round Table is Celtic, let me address myself to the question: how did they reach the French?

One outstanding fact established by the researches of the last fifty years is that the greatest number of striking analogs to Arthurian romance is to be found in Irish literature, many of them in Irish texts which have been dated on linguistic grounds before the twelfth century.³ Of course, Arthurian scholars differ among themselves as to the validity of Irish analogs discovered by other Arthurian scholars. The late Joseph Loth was skeptical of the Tristram parallels discovered by Miss Schoepperle in *Diarmaid and Grainne*;⁴ Professor F. N. Robinson expresses himself with extreme caution as to the parallels pointed out by Professor Maynadier between the *Wife of Bath's tale* and the Irish stories of the Sovranty;⁵ yet to me a genetic relationship seems to have been demonstrated in both instances. Though upholders of the hypothesis of Celtic origins do not agree on any list of established parallels between Irish and Arthurian tradition, most will agree that there are a considerable number of striking resemblances. To my mind they present a formidable array.

How did these Irish elements reach the French and become imbedded in stories of Arthur and his knights? Were they carried directly from Ireland to France? Were they imported by the Christian missionaries who poured into Frankish territory and founded Luxeuil, Jouarre, Faremoutiers, and Rebas in the seventh century? Or by

³ The most remarkable analogs are, I believe, to be found in G. H. Maynadier, *The Wife of Bath's tale* (London, 1901); G. L. Kittredge, *A study of Gawain and the Green Knight* (Cambridge, Mass., 1916); G. Schoepperle, *Tristan and Isolt* (New York and Frankfurt, 1913); T. P. Cross and W. A. Nitze, *Lancelot and Guenevere* (Chicago, 1930); Nitze, in *Studies in honor of A. M. Elliott* (Baltimore, 1911), I, 19; A. C. L. Brown, in *Mod. phil.*, XVIII (1920), 211-18; A. Taylor, in *Romanic rev.*, IX (1918), 21; A. H. Krappe, in *Zeits. f. franz. Sprache u. Lit.*, LVII (1933), 156; in *Romania*, LVIII (1932), 426; in *Romanische Forsch.*, XLV (1931), 95; L. H. Loomis, in *Mod. lang. rev.*, XXVI (1931), 408; R. S. Loomis, in *Speculum*, VIII (1933), 415; in *PMLA*, XLVIII (1933), 1000; in *Romania*, LIX (1933), 557; T. P. Cross, in *Manly anniversary studies* (1923), p. 284; G. S. Loomis, in *Vassar mediaeval studies* (1923), p. 3; F. Lot, in *Romania*, XXI (1892), 67; A. H. Krappe, *Balor of the Evil Eye* (New York, 1927), p. 132; A. C. L. Brown, *Iwain* (Boston, 1903), p. 80, n. 1; L. A. Hibbard, in *Romanic rev.*, IV (1913), 166; Zenker, in *Romanische Forsch.*, XXIX (1911), 331 ff.

⁴ *Rev. celt.*, XXXV (1918), 380.

⁵ Chaucer, *Works*, ed. F. N. Robinson (Boston, 1933), pp. 8, 807.

great scholars like Eriugena and Sedulius in the ninth century? Or by later scholars attracted to the monastic and cathedral schools of northern France? It is well to consider the possibility, even though it has not been proposed in print, and must be dismissed at once. The early Irish scholars have left in the libraries of Europe a good many traces of their activity in the form of glosses and poems, but not a trace of heroic and mythical legend.⁶ We know much of the interests of Eriugena and Sedulius, but nothing leads us to suppose that native profane sagas were included among them. And though it may well be that later Irish clerics played some part in bringing the legend of Brendan, St. Patrick's Purgatory, and St. Modwenna to the Anglo-Normans,⁷ the difference between these strongly ecclesiastical traditions, clearly attached to Ireland by name and localization, and the fictions of Lancelot, Gawain, and Morgan la Fée is enough to demonstrate that the latter could not have been introduced by the same agency. It is obvious that the Irish clergy who visited France did not belong to that class of *filid*⁸ who preserved and retold the traditions of Manannán, Lug, Cúroi, Cúchulainn, Midir, and Étaín, but they were interested in Christian learning. Moreover, if these Irish scholars had transplanted into Gaul their native legends of heroes and gods, and if these had taken root there, the later fruitage would have been found scattered throughout the vast orchard of medieval French narrative; they would have cropped out in Carolingian epics and in classical and oriental romance; they would have been common in saintly and religious contexts; they would have formed independent stories betraying by their nomenclature clear signs of Irish origin. But the fact is, these Irish motifs are found, with the exception of the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*,⁹ only in Breton lais and Arthurian romances. By and large, we may say that it is only in Breton, Welsh, and Cornish localizations, and pre-eminently in association with Arthur,

⁶ D'Arbois de Jubainville, *Essai d'un catalogue de la littérature épique de l'Irlande* (Paris, 1883), p. cxxiv: "Nous placerons dans une section à part les manuscrits latins ou grecs qui ne contiennent en fait d'irlandais que des gloses, ou quelques poèmes ou notes formant comme étendue une partie simplement accessoire dans le volume dont il s'agit. C'est le cas de tous les manuscrits continentaux antérieurs au douzième siècle."

⁷ J. F. Kenney, *Sources for the early history of Ireland* (New York, 1929), I, 355 f., 369, 412.

⁸ R. Thurneysen, *Die irische Helden- und Königsage* (Halle, 1921), pp. 66 ff.; *Mod. phil.*, IX (1911), 121 f.

⁹ L. H. Loomis and T. P. Cross, in *Mod. phil.*, XXV (1928), 331.

that we find these Celtic motifs. It is certain that Irish missionaries did not make these associations with Arthur, localize their stories in British territory, and deliberately suppress their Irish names. Neither would the French of their own initiative have been so curiously and consistently intent on canceling all signs of Irish origin and so eager to exalt the renown of a group of British heroes. Direct transmission from Ireland to France is a hypothesis which receives no corroboration from the facts.¹⁰

If we consider, however, the possibility that the Welsh were transmitters of Irish material, as well as contributors of native stories, we receive at once confirmatory evidence. Miss O'Rahilly¹¹ and Professor Slover¹² have assembled a mass of facts demonstrating political and literary contacts between Ireland and Wales. Professor Gruffydd has shown how profoundly one of the *Four Branches of the Mabinogi* is saturated with Irish traditions of Lug and Balor.¹³ Professor Hyde has pointed out Irish parallels to *Kilhwch and Olwen*.¹⁴ Irish influence on the very Welsh literature which developed into Arthurian romance is a plain fact. Brythonic stories of Bran, Pryderi, Rhiannon, and Llew¹⁵ are, on the one hand, mingled with Irish tales in the *Four Branches of the Mabinogi*, and, on the other hand, are to be definitely detected in Arthurian romance. Here, then, in Wales was not only the logical place for Irish saga to mingle with British myth and hero-legends of Arthur, but also the actual place where historical conditions favored their mingling and where we can observe currents flowing in from Ireland and flowing out to meet us again in French literature. The remains of the Welsh stage in this process of development are so scanty that it is not possible to point to a single story of which we possess the precise intermediate form between the Irish original and

¹⁰ Though in the *Lai de l'Espine* (ed. Zenker, in *Zeits. f. rom. Phil.*, XVII, 233) we read of an Irish harper who sang a "lai d'Orpheus," the surviving English lai of *Sir Orfeo* is a blend not only of classical and Irish elements but also of Breton. Cf. *Mod. lang. notes*, LI (1936), 28. We must adopt the alternative suggested by L. A. Hibbard, *Mediaeval romance in England* (New York, 1924), p. 199, that "the bilingual Breton minstrels may have turned the Orpheus story into the form of a lay which the Irish minstrel learned and sang."¹⁷

¹¹ C. O'Rahilly, *Ireland and Wales* (London, 1924).

¹² *University of Texas studies in English*, VI (1926), 5; VII (1927), 5.

¹³ W. J. Gruffydd, *Math Vab Mathonwy* (Cardiff, 1928).

¹⁴ *Transactions of the fourth Celtic Congress* (Swansea, 1923), p. 39.

¹⁵ *Mod. lang. rev.*, XXIV (1929), 418, 427; *Revue celt.*, XLVII (1930), 39; *Speculum*, VIII (1933), 426-30; *PMLA*, XLV (1930), 432-41.

the French romance. We can, however, say that the famous Irish story of the betrayal of Cúroi by Bláthnat (Little Flower) descends into Welsh as the betrayal of Llew by Blodeuwedd (Flower Face)¹⁶ and into Arthurian romance as the betrayal of Caradoc of the Dolorous Tower by a woman, presumably named Floree, and as the betrayal of Milocrates by his wife in the *De Ortu Walwanii*.¹⁷ Thus we have several Irish, one Welsh, and two Arthurian versions of the same story, though it must be conceded that the Welsh tale does not stand in the direct line of descent.

To the fact that the *Four Branches* and *Kilhwch* afford us a transitional stage between Irish and Arthurian legend we may add that not only was Arthur himself a British hero but also a large number of French Arthurian names can be derived from the Welsh with more or less certainty. Certain names of undoubted Welsh origin are to be found not only in the French romances but in Wace as well: Beduier, Calibore, Gawain, Genievre, Keus, Lot, Merlin, Mordret, Uter Pendragon, and Yder son of Nut. Wace, of course, got these names from Geoffrey of Monmouth, and it may be asked: Is Geoffrey the source of the Arthurian onomasticon? There is one decisive test. Geoffrey provides a list of the notables who attended Arthur's coronation, and Fletcher and M. Faral have shown that the list is largely fabricated from Welsh genealogies.¹⁸ It is of no small significance that not one of these Welsh names, thus unscrupulously borrowed by Geoffrey and repeated by Wace, appears in Chrétien de Troyes or the Vulgate cycle. The same holds true of the non-Celtic names which Geoffrey included among Arthur's chief warriors: Guitart of Poitiers, Gerin of Chartres, Holdin of Flanders, and Borel of Le Mans, except that the last is mentioned once in the *Vulgate Merlin*. Not one of these manifestly spurious names found favor with the French romancers. Why? Because they possessed the critical instinct and the apparatus of a modern scholar, and saw through Geoffrey's little game? Nonsense! The only sane explanation is that the romancers derived their Welsh names, not from Wace, but, however indirectly, from Welsh tradition.

¹⁶ Gruffydd, pp. 260-70.

¹⁷ R. S. Loomis, *Celtic myth and Arthurian romance*, pp. 7, 11-15, 22, n. 36.

¹⁸ R. H. Fletcher, *Arthurian materials in the chronicles* (Boston, 1906), pp. 76 f.; E. Faral, *La légende arthurienne: première partie*, II (Paris, 1929), 276.

This view is substantiated by the fact that the French romancers knew many Welsh names which do not appear in Wace at all. There will be no question that the boar Tortain is derived from the boar Twrch Trwyth, the cat Chapalu from the cat Cath Paluc, Brangien from Branwen, Yseult from Esyllt, Mabon from Mabon, Giflet fils Do from Gilfaethwy son of Don, Maheloas and Meleagant from Maelwas.¹⁹ There are also solid grounds for supposing that Bran de Lis, Brangor, Bron, Brandus des Iles, Morgain la Fée, Niniane, Pelles, Pellinore, Perceval, Pierre, Lancelot, Guahries, and Guirres derived their names from important figures in Welsh, and that Lac and Lion are simply French translations of Llwh and Llew.²⁰ Arthurian topography, too, has a considerable Welsh element: Caerleon, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Sugales, Destregalles, Norgales, the Chastel de la Marche, which I have identified with Dinas Bran near Llangollen,²¹ and Dinasdaron, which is probably a corruption of the same name.²² What more could one ask as proof of a Welsh contribution to French romance?

At this point one must determine whether or not there was an important tributary flowing into Wales from Southern Scotland, where the Brythonic population of Strathclyde maintained itself for centuries as distinct from the neighboring Piets of Galloway and the Angles of Bernicia. Welsh literature, as Morris-Jones, Anwyl, and Professor Ifor Williams have shown,²³ contains many allusions to this region and its kings and heroes. Dr. Brugger has written voluminously, but less successfully, to prove that the topography of the district is reflected in French Arthurian romance. It is at least certain that Galvoie and Cardoil are Galloway and Carlisle, and fairly probable that Escalot represents Aleclut (Dumbarton).²⁴ Ivain, son of Urien,

¹⁹ J. D. Bruce, *Evolution of Arthurian romance* (Baltimore, Göttingen, 1923), I, 41 (n. 9), 51, 183; J. Loth, *Contributions à l'étude ...* (Paris, 1912), p. 103; *Zeits. f. franz. Sprache u. Lit.*, XLVI (1923), 265-73; J. Rhys, *Studies in the Arthurian legend* (Oxford, 1891), p. 51.

²⁰ Cf. my *Celtic myth and Arthurian romance*, index, and *Revue celt.*, XLVII (1930), 39 ff.; *Mod. lang. rev.*, XXIV (1929), 418, 427; *PMLA*, XLV (1930), 432-41.

²¹ *Miscellany of studies in honour of L. E. Kastner* (Cambridge, 1932), p. 342.

²² There are three romances which owe their detailed localizations in Celtic territory to late efforts: *Fergus* (cf. *PMLA*, XLIV [1929], 360; *Kastner miscellany*, p. 94); *Rigomer* (cf. Bruce, *Evolution*, II, 246); *Historia Meriadoci*, ed. J. D. Bruce (Baltimore and Göttingen, 1913), p. xxv.

²³ *Cymmrodor*, XXVIII (1918), 187 ff.; *Celtic rev.*, IV (1907-8), 125, 249; *Proceedings of the British Academy*, XVIII (1932), 270.

²⁴ *Mort Artu*, ed. J. D. Bruce (Halle, 1910), pp. 269 f.

moreover, is without doubt Owain, son of Urien, a prince of the northern Britons in the second half of the sixth century. But the only evidence that story material as well as names from Scotland reached the French is found in the legend of Tristram. Zimmer first pointed out that the Welsh form of the hero's name, Drystan, son of Tallweh, belonged originally to Drust, son of Talorc, a Pictish king of about the year 780.²⁵ Brugger has demonstrated that Tristram's kingdom of Loenois was Lothian, which, though it may not have been the kingdom of Drust, did include some Pictish territory.²⁶ Deutschbein in a strangely neglected article clinched the matter by showing that part of the saga of Drust has been preserved in the Irish *Wooing of Emer*, a section of which corresponds strikingly to the romance of Tristram.²⁷ In this very section a Drust is mentioned as one of the heroes subordinate to Cúchulainn, and in this section alone; the localization is in the Hebrides, not far from Pictish territory. It seems perfectly clear that certain youthful adventures of Tristram, including the human tribute demanded from Ireland, his asking and learning the cause of the mourning, his fight, his wounding, the false claimant, the recognition of the hero in the bath, his rejection of a royal bride, are a part of a saga originally attached to Drust, the Pictish king. This narrative tributary certainly flowed into Wales, and was duly elaborated, as we know, under the influence of the Irish tales of Diarmaid and Grainne.

Cornwall made its contribution also to this and other Arthurian legends. Not only does Tintagel serve as a background to some of the most memorable incidents, not only does King Mark seem to owe his name to a Cornish king of the sixth century, but also the name forms of Gorlois and Modred are not Welsh but Cornish,²⁸ and it must have been from the southwest that Geoffrey of Monmouth got the traditions of Arthur's birth and his last battle.

²⁵ *Zeits. f. franz. Sprache u. Lit.*, XIII¹ (1891), 69.

²⁶ *Mod. phil.*, XXII (1924), 159; *Miscellany of studies . . .* L. E. Kastner (Cambridge, 1932), pp. 97 ff. On Celtic Tristram legend cf. J. van Dam, in *Neophilologus*, XV (1929), 19 ff.; J. Kelemlina, *Geschichte der Tristramsage* (Vienna, 1923), pp. 201 ff.

²⁷ *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, XV (1904), 16. On the transmission of the Tristram legend cf. Thomas, *Tristan*, ed. Bédier, II (Paris, 1905), 103-24; Bruce, *Evolution*, I, 177-86; R. S. Loomis, in *Romania*, LIII (1927), 82 ff.

²⁸ *Romania*, XXX (1901), 11. The statement that the name Tristram in the form Drustagni is found in Cornwall has been disputed, and Macallister reads it as Cirusinius (*Archaeologia Cambrensis*, LXXXIV [1929], 181).

We now come to the final question: How did this mass of Celtic tradition pass from the Celtic peoples to the French—through the Anglo-Normans, or through the Bretons, or through both? Everything points to the Bretons; nothing, so far as I know, to the Anglo-Normans. Gaston Paris' theory of Anglo-Norman transmission rested on little except a passage in *Waldef* and the presence of a few English words in Marie de France's *lais*.²⁹ The passage in *Waldef* asserts that the French translated *Tristan* from an English original; but the internal evidence of Bérout, Eilhart, and Thomas contradicts this statement so flatly that no one today accepts it. If Thomas placed Mark's court at London, it is obviously because he was himself attached to the Angevin court; if Bérout introduced the one word *lovendrinc*, it does not imply an English source for the poem any more than a few French words in an English novel involve a similar conclusion. Though Marie twice gives her *lais* English titles as well as French, she explicitly says that Bretons composed *Laustic*, and there is nothing English or Anglo-Norman about the names or the setting of *Chievrefoil*. All we know is that Thomas, Marie, and perhaps Bérout wrote for Anglo-Norman readers, but there is no reason to suppose that they took any of their materials directly from Welsh sources.

There are, moreover, two poems, one Anglo-Norman, one English, of which the internal evidence answers clearly the question whether the Welsh transmitted Arthurian stories to their neighbors across the border. The first is the *Lai du Cor*, composed by the Anglo-Norman, Robert Biquet, about 1150. The author knows or has invented a tradition that the magic horn was preserved at Cirencester, not fifty miles from Offa's Dike, and here, if anywhere, in the earliest bit of Arthurian romance in Anglo-Norman, we should expect to find signs of direct importation from Wales. Yet when we look at the name forms which might be expected to resemble the Welsh forms, we find on the contrary names that are even more remote from the Welsh than any similar list in Continental romances. The Bodleian MS furnishes the following forms: Gauuein, Giflet, Iuuein, Mangounz de Moraine, Gauwain, Iuwain, Arzur, Keerz, Kadoin, Goher, Muz, Aguisiaus, Glouien, Kadoiners, Lot, Caratoun, Garadue, Galahal.³⁰

²⁹ *Romania*, XV (1886), 597; XVIII (1889), 510. For criticism of Paris cf. Thomas, *Tristan*, ed. Bédier, II, 315 f.; *Zeits. f. franz. Sprache u. Lit.*, XXXII², 138; *Bonner Studien u. englische Phil.*, IV, xxiii; Bruce, *Evolution*, I, 61 f., 154 n.

³⁰ Cf. ed. F. Wulff (Lund, 1888).

In this earliest of poems about Arthur written in England and preserved to our time there is not one name which suggests immediate borrowing from the Welsh.

We turn to Layamon's *Brut*, composed late in the twelfth or early in the thirteenth century at Arley Regis, not more than thirty-five miles from Offa's Dike. Bruce demonstrated that two of the most significant proper names which Layamon added to Wace—Argante and Melian—find their close counterparts not in Welsh nomenclature but in French romances.³¹ Since Layamon did not inspire the Vulgate *Mort Artu* or the *Didot Perceval*, there must have been a common source. Celtic elements there certainly are in Layamon, but he seems to have got them through a French medium. One may assert with some confidence that, whatever the reason, Arthurian material did not pass from Wales to France across England.

There remain the Bretons. Foerster's claim that they were the inventors of the romantic tradition of Arthur and that they drew nothing from Wales and Ireland has been thoroughly shot to pieces. But his claim that the Breton *conteurs* were an important agency in the promulgation of the *matière de Bretagne* is supported by an impressive body of facts.³² It will be unnecessary to do more than recall the importance of Nantes and the Forest of Broceliande in Chrétien, and the derivation of the name Erec from the historic Guerec, a count of Nantes, who died about 980.³³ Add to this the Breton names which Bédier found in the Tristram legend,³⁴ and the localization of the hero's birth and death in Brittany. Add the fact that the names of Lancelot and Morgain la Fée are best explained as transformations of Welsh Llenlleawc and Modron under the influence of names recorded in Breton documents—Lancelin and Morecant.³⁵ Add, moreover, names found in Breton documents: Ivanus, recorded in 1083³⁶ and representing the transitional form between Welsh Owain and French

³¹ *Mod. lang. notes*, XXVI (1911), 65; cf. *Rev. of Engl. stud.*, X (1934), 80 f.

³² Christian von Troyes, *Erec und Enide*, ed. W. Foerster (Halle, 1890), pp. xxxviii f.; *Karrenritter*, ed. Foerster (Halle, 1899), pp. cxi-cxxvii.

³³ Lot, in *Romania*, XXV, 588; cf. R. S. Loomis, *Celtic myth*, p. 94.

³⁴ Thomas, *Tristan*, ed. Bédier, II, 122 f.

³⁵ R. S. Loomis, pp. 92, 192; *Romania*, LIV (1928), 517; for Lancelin (not, however, a Breton name) cf. H. Morice, *Mémoires pour servir de preuves*, Vol. I, col. 432.

³⁶ *Mémoires*, cols. 457, 469. Geoffrey's Eventus, son of Urien, and Even or Evain, found in Tyolet (vs. 630) and the *Didot Perceval* (J. L. Weston, *Legend of Sir Perceval*, II, 19 n.), are probably derived from Breton Even, cited frequently after 833.

Ivain; Moraldus, recorded somewhat earlier,³⁷ palpably the immediate source (whatever may be the ultimate origin) of the name of Tristram's redoubtable opponent, Morhaut. Add the presence on the Modena sculpture, dated 1099-1106, of a name like Winlogée, which is clearly an intermediate form between Breton Winlowen and French Guinloie.³⁸ Wherever we turn in the French romances we are greeted by names which are obviously Breton or have undergone assimilation to names recorded in Brittany. The onomastic evidence, which is decidedly negative in regard to Anglo-Norman transmission, is decidedly positive in favor of Breton transmission.

Apart from the internal evidence of the romances there is the external evidence assembled by Brugger.³⁹ It may be summed up in the statement that when William of Malmesbury, Giraldus Cambrensis, and Wace refer to the promulgators of Arthurian story as a class, they speak uniformly of *Britones* or *Bretons*, never of *Wallenses*, *Cambrenses*, or *Gallois*.⁴⁰ If it be suspected that William and Giraldus must be referring to Welshmen in spite of the fact that they use a term no longer applied to contemporary Welshmen, note that William speaks elsewhere of Gawain as Walwen,⁴¹ a form unrecorded in Welsh literature, equally remote from Gwalchmei, which the Welsh substituted for French Galvain, and from Gwallt-Avwyn, which, in my judgment, is the Welsh original of Galvain.⁴² Note, too, that in the two passages in which Giraldus speaks of a *historico cantore Britone*⁴³ and of the *fabulosi Britones et eorum cantores* he also speaks of Morganis as carrying Arthur to Avalon to be healed of his wounds. Now both Morgan and Avalon are unknown to the Welsh under these forms; they know only Modron and Avallach.⁴⁴ Geoffrey of Monmouth himself cites as his authority for the *Historia regum Britanniae* a book which Walter the archdeacon had brought *ex Britannia*; and

³⁷ *Mémoires*, col. 436.

³⁸ *Medieval studies in memory of G. Schoepperle Loomis* (Paris and New York, 1927), p. 222.

³⁹ *Zeits. f. franz. Sprache u. Lit.*, XX¹ (1898), 79 ff.; XLIV² (1922), 78 ff.

⁴⁰ E. K. Chambers, *Arthur of Britain* (London, 1927), pp. 250, 272.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 250.

⁴² *PMLA*, XLIII (1928), 384 ff.

⁴³ Cf. Nitze, in *Speculum*, IX (1934), 358.

⁴⁴ R. S. Loomis, *Celtic myth and Arthurian romance*, pp. 192, 344 f.; J. Loth, *Mabinogion* (Paris, 1913), II, 237, 288; Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Historia*, ed. San Marte (Halle, 1854), p. 374; *Cymmrodor*, VIII (1887), 85.

this must be Brittany, for otherwise an Anglo-Norman could not have brought the book out of "Britain" into England, and Geoffrey himself expressly writes: "Armoricum regnum, quod nunc Britannia dicitur."⁴⁵ Even though we dismiss the Breton book as a figment of Geoffrey's imagination, it is significant that he did not cite a Welsh book as his authority; and though he certainly used, as we have seen, Welsh genealogies to concoct a spurious roster of Arthur's knights, the traditional Arthurian names which he did mention—particularly Hider and Galwainus—are obviously closer in form to French Ider and Gauvain than to Welsh Eder and Gwallt-Avwyn.⁴⁶ Internal and external evidence makes it plain that even Welshmen of the twelfth century knew and turned to Breton versions of Arthurian story in preference to their own native traditions.⁴⁷

Foerster, though he grossly underestimated the talent and the influence of the Breton *conteurs*, rightly ascribed to them the introduction of the Round Table cycle among the French. To do so they must have spoken French. The *cantores* mentioned by Giraldus must be the professional singers of Breton lais, but their repertoire, though occasionally it touched Arthurian themes, was in the main distinct. The reciters of Arthurian tales must have used prose. Chrétien de Troyes in his *Conte del graal* declares his purpose as "rimoier le meilleur conte ... qui soit contez an cort real,"⁴⁸ that is, "to turn into rime the best tale that may be told at a royal court." The continuator, Wauchier, in a passage seldom cited but significant, writes in these terms:

Mais il sont ore maint vassal
Qui fabloient vont par les cours
Qui les contes font à rebours,

⁴⁵ Book V, chap. xii.

⁴⁶ Loomis, pp. 345 f.; cf. Zimmer, in *Zeits. f. franz. Sprache u. Lit.*, XII, 231.

⁴⁷ It might be well to reconsider the oft-cited passage about the return of Rhys ap Tewdwr from Brittany in 1077, bringing with him the system of the Round Table to South Wales, where it had been forgotten, and restoring it in regard to minstrels and bards (cf. *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1890, p. 796). Of late this statement has been rejected because it occurs in the MSS of Iolo Morganwg, who early in the nineteenth century introduced as much confusion into Welsh studies as Macpherson and Villemarqué have done in Gaelic and Breton. Nevertheless Professor Gruffydd says of these MSS in his *Math Vab Mathonwy* (Cardiff, 1928), p. 203 n.: "I refer to this much suspected source with all due reserve, but it may be safely stated that a large portion of the information given in the Iolo MSS. goes back directly or indirectly to genuinely ancient sources." Is it likely that the patriotic Iolo would have concocted a story to the discredit of Wales, and could have by accident fancied a situation so harmonious with evidence of which he knew nothing? Cf. Watkin, in *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion*, 1919-20, p. 5.

⁴⁸ Vss. 63, 65.

Et des estoires les eslongent
 Et les mençoignes i ajoignent,
 Et cil ki l'oent et escoutent
 Ne sèvent que bon conte montent,
 Ains dient ke cil ménestrel
 Qui gisent la nuit en l'ostel,
 Quant on leur fait .i. poi conter
 D'une aventure *sans rimer*,
 Qu'il ont toute l'estore oïe,
 Qu'il jà n'aront jor de lor vie,
 Si lor font tout mençoigne acroire
 Et il le sèvent bien aoire
 Et bien acroistre et metre avant.⁴⁹

This passage should be compared with Chrétien's statement that the story of *Erec* was one which "devant rois et devant contes Depecier et corronpre suelent Cil qui de conter vivre vuelent."⁵⁰ Wace, however, referring to the same *conteurs* in 1155, is more complimentary to their art if not to their veracity:

Tant ont li contéor conté
 Et li fabléor tant fablé
 Por lor contes ambeleter,
 Que tout ont fait fables sanbler.⁵¹

And Peter of Blois about 1190 witnesses that the tragic stories of Arthur, Gawain, and Tristram had the power of moving the listeners to tears.⁵² That these *conteurs* were Bretons is shown by the well-known references of Wace:

Fist Artus la Roonde Table
 Dont Breton dient mainte fable.

 E cil deuers Brecheliand,
 Donec Breton uont souent fabland.⁵³

Both external testimony and internal evidence confirm the view that the early popularization on the Continent was the work of these anonymous Breton *conteurs*.

Zimmer and M. Bédier have emphasized the close association of Bretons with Normans and Anglo-Normans as a possible explanation

⁴⁹ C. Potvin, *Perceval le Gallois* (Mons, 1866-71), Vol. IV, vss. 28376 ff.

⁵⁰ Vss. 20-22.

⁵¹ Wace, *Brut*, ed. Leroux de Lincy (Rouen, 1838), Vol. II, vss. 10040 ff.

⁵² Chambers, p. 267.

⁵³ Wace, *Brut*, vss. 9998 ff.; *Roman de Rou*, vss. 6395 f.

of the diffusion of Arthurian narrative in France and England.⁵⁴ It seems fairly certain that after the Norman Conquest, in which the Bretons had a notable share, Breton minstrels and *conteurs* swarmed into England. The allusions of William of Malmesbury and Giraldus Cambrensis, already cited, and the evidence of Marie de France seem otherwise incomprehensible. It is also highly probable that the Breton *conteurs* found patronage in the Norman kingdoms of Apulia and Sicily, for the cathedral pavement at Otranto, made between 1163 and 1166, displays Arthur riding on a goat,⁵⁵ and in the early thirteenth century a tradition that the wounded Arthur still lived on in a palace on Mount Etna is found firmly established.⁵⁶ Nevertheless, Breton association with the Normans should not be overrated as a factor in the spread of the *matière de Bretagne*. Professor Levi's thesis and mine that the court of Poitou and Eleanor of Aquitaine herself did much for the vogue of the Tristram romance has commended itself to several scholars.⁵⁷ Chrétien might have composed his Arthurian poems even if there had been no contact of Bretons and Normans. Once the *conteurs* of Haute Bretagne had learned to speak French, they were free of the courts of all North France. Their patrons, the kings and counts of whom Chrétien speaks, were not exclusively their neighbors of Normandy or d'Outre-Manche.

Moreover, though these *conteurs* of the twelfth century must have been in the main of Breton extraction, we may concede the possibility of exceptions. It would be strange if by the end of the century there were not some Frenchmen in the profession, retelling and embellishing the tales of their Breton predecessors. The greatest exception to my generalization is the Welshman Bleheris or Bledfri, who alone of all the *conteurs* has left us his name and a reputation.⁵⁸ But if we are to judge by the content of the romances which claim him as authority, his repertoire was in no way distinct from the rest of the French cycle;

⁵⁴ Thomas, *Tristan*, ed. Bédier, II (Paris, 1905), 126 ff.

⁵⁵ *Studi medievalesi*, II (1906-7), 512, pl. XI; Bertaux, *L'art dans l'Italie méridionale* (Paris, 1904), I, 490.

⁵⁶ A. Graf, *Miti, leggende, e superstizioni del Medio Evo* (Turin, 1893), II, 303 ff.; P. S. Barto, *Tannhäuser and the Mountain of Venus* (New York, 1916), pp. 11-16; E. G. Gardner, *Arthurian legend in Italian literature* (London, 1930), pp. 12-15.

⁵⁷ *Studi romansi*, XIV (1917), 177 f.; *Mod. lang. notes*, XXXIX, 322-25; *Romania*, LIII (1927), 89. Cf. *Neophilologus*, XV (1929), 31 f.; *Literaturblatt f. germ. u. rom. Phil.*, XLIX, 170; E. S. Murrell, *Girart de Roussillon and the Tristan poems* (Chesterfield, 1926), pp. 72 ff.

⁵⁸ For bibliography of Bleheris cf. *Mod. phil.* XXII, 123 n. Cf. esp. *Mod. lang. notes*, XXXIX, 319; *Romania*, LIII (1927), 82; *Neophilologus*, XV, 30-34.

there is no more knowledge of the topography of Wales; no closer approximation to Welsh name forms; on the contrary, there is the usual sprinkling of Breton names. I take the existence and the influence of Bleheris very seriously, but I am obliged to conclude that he spoke French, made up his repertoire from Breton or French sources, and owed his fame to the fact that he excelled all his confrères in the verve and passion of his recital. But his narrative material, if basically Welsh, had been already acclimated on the Continent.

This paper is largely founded on the researches of Zimmer, Foerster, Dr. Brugger, M. Bédier, and those Celtists who have studied the literary relations between Ireland and Wales. My own contribution, apart from certain details, consists in the attempt to show how the evidence on the origin of the Arthurian legend and its transmission from the Celts to the French can be wrought into a harmonious pattern. Unless I am much mistaken, that evidence is not confused and conflicting, but presents a clear and definite plan. We see Wales as the natural meeting place for Irish and Brythonic myth and saga; we see North Britain and Cornwall making their natural contributions; we see the Bretons of the Continent as the natural links between their cousins the Welsh and their neighbors the French. It is a conception which, to my thinking, is the key to many locks. Problems of nomenclature find an answer; the presence of Irish motifs in every stage of rationalization and decomposition is comprehensible; the sudden interest of the French in an obscure British war-chief is accounted for on the theory of infection by the Bretons; the difference between *Kilhwch and Olwen* and Chrétien de Troyes's romances is comprehensible when we realize that perhaps two centuries of divergent development lie between, leaving only four clear parallels: the ride of the youthful hero to Arthur's court, his demanding a boon, Kai's churlish reception, and the giant herdsman.⁵⁹ To understand the characteristic failings of oral tradition and to understand the constant effort, first of the Bretons, later of the French, to bring order and reason and chivalric manners into a beautiful but bewildering mass of story, is, I believe, to understand in large measure the legend of Arthur and his Table Round.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

⁵⁹ Note the less obvious parallels between *Kilhwch* and Arthurian romance mentioned in Loomis, *Celtic myth*, pp. 73, 100.

THE BIRTHPLACE OF GAUTIER DE COINCY

†LOUIS ALLEN

Car il n'est nus, tant sache querre,
Qui puist trover, ce sachiez bien,
Si doz païs comme le sien.

—GAUTIER DE COINCY

NO READER of the *Miracles Notre Dame* who observes carefully the language of the author, as disclosed by his rhymes, can doubt that Gautier was of Picard origin. Although occasionally non-Picard forms occur, which reflect rather the speech of Soissons or Vic-sur-Aisne, where Gautier spent all but the earliest portion of his life, his language is fundamentally Picard, and one is naturally led to seek his birthplace in the region where Picard speech prevailed, namely, in the territory comprised by the western half of the department of Nord, the departments of Pas-de-Calais, Somme, the northern and central portions of Oise, and the northwest corner of Aisne.

In most of the manuscripts of the *Miracles Notre Dame* the name of his birthplace is spelled *Coins(s)i*. The writer, however, remembers distinctly having seen the form *Conssi* in at least one of the manuscripts of the *Miracles*. Of the two manuscripts that have preserved Gautier's *Vie de sainte Cristine*,¹ we find that the later Paris manuscript has *Coinssi*, while the older Carpentras manuscript has *Cossi*, almost certainly for *Conssi*.

In the *Vie de sainte Cristine* we find that *Co(n)ssi* rhymes with *issi*. In the prologue to the *Miracles Notre Dame* it rhymes with *einsi*. But the rhyme proves little, as the richness of Gautier's rhyme varies greatly.

Our only source of information for the life of Gautier, aside from hints in his own works, is the *Chronicon Sancti Medardi Suessionensis*, which has the following two entries:

MCXCIII, Galterus de Coussiac monachus factus est tempore Bertranni abbatis: erat quindecim vel sexdecim annorum.

MCCXIV, Galterus verò de Coussiac prior de Vico efficitur mense augusti.

¹ Andreas C. Ott, *Gautier de Coincy's Christinenleben* (Erlangen, 1922).

The text of the *Chronicon* as printed in Dom Bouquet, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, XVIII, 720–21, has *Galterus de Coinciaco*. The Benedictine compilers of this great collection identify Galterus de *Coinciaco* with the fameux poète François du xiii^e siècle and even suggest that the chronicle itself *paroit être l'ouvrage de Gautier de Coinci*. They apparently assumed that the birthplace of Gautier was Coincy, a village in the canton of Fère-en-Tardenois, between Soissons and Château-Thierry, and did not hesitate to change the reading of the manuscript from *Coussiaco* to *Coinciaco*, although they might better have written *Consiaco*, *Consiacum* being the Latin form of *Coincy* used in the Middle Ages, and the form which we find in *Gallia Christiana*, compiled by the same Benedictine congregation.

In *Gallia Christiana*, IX, 417, in the account of the abbots of Saint-Médard of Soissons, drawn from the same chronicle, we find *Galterus de Coucinco*, the compilers having interpreted the name as equivalent to *Coucy*.

The Abbé Poquet gives us the true reading of the chronicle, namely, *Galterus de Coussiaco*. He supposes that *Coussiaco* is a misreading for *Consiaco*, or even *Coinciaco*.² His first suggestion is a very reasonable one, and *Coussiaco* should undoubtedly be interpreted as for *Consiaco*, which would be the latinization of a form *Conssi*, or *Coinssi*, and which would represent in Gautier's time the pronunciation, outside of Picard territory, of the Gallo-Roman place-name *Conciacum*.

It would seem that the birthplace of Gautier should be sought among the various descendants of *Conciacum*, but more specifically among those to be found in Picard territory.

Certain place-name references in the *Miracles* appear to throw a little light on the problem. We find a certain number of such references that have no direct connection with the narratives in which they occur. Most of them, to be sure, have some point, as when he says:

S'a la foire est mes cuers a Troies,
A Mosteruel, ou au Lendit,
Que vaut ce que ma bouche dit?³

² *Ibid.*, p. cxxxvi.

³ The quotations from the *Miracles Notre Dame* are from a photostat copy of MS B.N. 22928.

Here he mentions towns noted for their fairs. He refers to Montpellier because of its medical faculty:

En Salerne n'a Montpellier
N'a si bonne fisicienne.

But why should he in four different places have mentioned Roye? The following are the four passages:

En li (sainte Leochade) avons bone concierge;
Maint parisi, mainte roële
D'outre *Roie* nos aroële.
D'un archevesque qui fu a Tholete.

S'un jor ere en liu de roy,
Por Rains, por Rome ne por *Roye*
Laissier un (Giu) vivre n'en porroie.
D'un archevesque qui fu a Tholete.

Vers aus (Gius) sui durs si durement
Que, s'iere rois, por toute *Roie*
Un a durer n'en endurroie.
De l'enfant a un Giu qui se crestiena.

Assez, par saint Florent de *Roye* ...
De l'empereris de Romme.

These passages appear to suggest some special familiarity with Roye on the part of our poet. Roye may very well have formed a part of his boyhood memories. It would seem to be reasonable to look in the neighborhood of Roye for his birthplace.

A dozen kilometers southwest of Roye we find the town of Conchy (Conchy-les-Pots, Conchy-la-Poterie). In Gautier's time Conchy would, outside of Picard territory, naturally have taken the form *Conssi*. We have no need to suppose that Gautier changed *Conchy* to *Conssi* to avoid any unpleasant suggestion of *conchier*, one of his favorite verbs. We find in thirteenth-century manuscripts such variants as *Couci*, *Couchi*, *Coussi*; *Rouci*, *Rouchi*, *Roussi*; *Galice*, *Galiche*, *Galise*. That Picard *ch* and *Francien c* were pronounced *s(s)* by Gautier in his new environment is shown by his frequent rhyming of *tens(s)er* (*tencier*) with *penser*. Gautier de Conchy would thus naturally have called himself Gautier de Conssi, or perhaps even Gautier de Coinssi, while living at Soissons or at Vic-sur-Aisne. That variant pronuncia-

tions of Conchy such as *Coinchy*, *Coinssi*, showing a more pronounced influence of the yod on the vowel of the initial syllable, may have existed in some part of the territory where people had occasion to speak of Conchy, and may have been used by Gautier himself, is by no means improbable. The form *Coinssi* found in the manuscripts may, however, be due to an early copyist, living possibly at Soissons, who substituted for *Conssi* (*Conchy*), the real birthplace of Gautier, the better-known *Coinssi* (*Coincy*), where there was a Cluniac monastery.

As a proposed identification for Gautier's birthplace Conchy has in its favor that it is situated in that part of Picard territory to which his language points, that it agrees well with the form *Conssi*, that it explains the allusions to Roye, and that it is not at too great a distance from Soissons.⁴

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

⁴ [The sudden death of Professor Allen in France in the summer of 1935 prevented him from reading the proofs of this article.—Ed.]

THREE TERMS OF THE CORPUSCULARIAN PHILOSOPHY

GORDON KEITH CHALMERS

MANY of the atomistic ideas in English thought before the chartering of the Royal Society in 1662 pass unnoticed today because we do not recognize the technical terms by which in the seventeenth century they were communicated. In natural philosophy the problem of how matter is made up was somewhat new, experiments having offered puzzling qualifications to the old hypotheses. In a way the seventeenth-century solution of the problem was also new, and to express this the literary men and philosophers employed new words.

To consider first the thing in Renaissance atomism which demanded a new name, we might turn to Sir Thomas Browne; for Browne's laboratory experiments, recorded in *Pseudodoxia epidemica* (1646) and in his notebooks and letters, show that he was familiar with the new scientific doctrines of his time. Furthermore, among the revolutionary physical hypotheses which he entertained are to be found in part at least the principles which his younger contemporary, Robert Boyle, was to call the "Corpuscularian philosophy." Browne's experiments in magnetism show that this is true; so do his theories of the structure of gems, of the mediums of sensation, of the spread of the plague, of the action of steel on flint, and of the effluvia of medicines which act without abatement of weight.¹ Frequently when describing his observations and reasoning on them Browne used the words *effluvium*, *effluxion*, and *emission*.

His general belief in a particulate matter Sir Thomas proposed in a sentence which follows his account of the invisible particles which stream off from the lodestone. He wrote:

And truly the doctrine of effluxions, their penetrating natures, their in-

¹ The background of Browne's physics was Stoical, for his first teacher was Galen. Consequently many of his hypotheses were the reverse of atomistic, being based on the idea that matter is vital and continuous. How much of Browne's science was Stoical, how much Epicurean, I have attempted to demonstrate elsewhere. In the present study I am concerned only with some of the seventeenth-century terms by which he and his contemporaries described the new hypotheses of particles. When Browne's whole natural philosophy is examined it will be found that the "Corpuscularian" view of matter played a very important part.

visible paths, and unsuspected effects, are very considerable; for, besides this magnetical one of the earth, several effusions there may be from divers other bodies, which invisibly act their parts at any time, and, perhaps, through any medium; a part of philosophy but yet in discovery, and will, I fear, prove the last leaf to be turned over in the book of nature.²

Chemists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had gradually found that atoms offered them a more acceptable account of decomposition and mixture than the ancient Empedoclean elements, air, earth, fire, and water, or the substances of alchemy, salt, sulphur, and mercury. Doctors and chemists such as Sanctorius, Basso, Jung, Senert, and Van Helmont had observed in their own researches that matter is probably particulate; but though skilled in observation, they were inexperienced reasoners; so for a system of their newly discovered matter they fell back on the ideas of Epicurus and Lucretius. But from the start this was unsatisfactory because the ancient atomic science contained principles about which the Renaissance chemists were unwilling to commit themselves, namely, that the unit of all decomposition and mixtion is the physical minimum, and that besides this minimum (the atom or uncut, and consequently the uncuttable) the world is made up of void. All that the chemists could deduce from their experiments was that matter is not continuous; whether the particles which seemed to shift places in chemical recombination were the minimum possible of matter or not they weren't prepared to say. And they suspected the idea of a vacuum, even after the experiment of Toricelli (1643) seemed to prove its existence. So it was natural that they should use terms of their own to describe their own atomism.

One of these was *particle*, another *corpuscle*, giving rise in the third quarter of the seventeenth century to the title of Robert Boyle's theory of matter, the "Corpuscularian philosophy." As this scheme of the natural world was taking shape in the minds of Boyle's predecessors, another term, *effluvium*, proved useful, and in 1673 Boyle entitled his demonstrations of the particulate nature of matter:

Essays of Effluvioms, Of the Strange Subtilty,
Great Efficacy, Determinate Nature of Effluvioms.
To which are annex New Experiments to make Fire
and Flame Ponderable.

² Sir Thomas Browne, *Works*, ed. Simon Wilkin (London, 1835-36), II, 286-87. Hereafter references to this edition of Browne's works will be made as follows: II. W. 286.

As I have said, the term *effluvium*, and the allied words *effluxion* and *emission*, had new meanings in the Renaissance. In the few incidents of their history which I shall relate are suggested some of the intellectual ancestry of Renaissance atomism, a natural philosophy which was both Epicurean and not Epicurean, and which not only preceded the revival of Epicurism in morals but doubtless contributed largely to it.

By an effluvium Robert Boyle understood something material which flows off. He demonstrated its existence by vaporizing water and condensing it into drops on a marble wall, by volatilizing brimstone, allowing the sulphur fumes to condense into flowers of sulphur and, by melting the flowers, reducing them again into brimstone. These effluvia are visible, but our sense of smell shows us that they may be too subtle to be seen; for example, when a small quantity of musk fills a whole room with its odor and when some smells produce a headache. Physical results are produced by the effluvia of the onion, said Boyle, when they bring tears to our eyes.³ "The effluvia of bodies," he said, "may consist of particles extremely small." The particles are very thin; they move swiftly and to a great distance, propelled by their own vigor. They keep their own shapes and enter only into the pores of solid bodies which are large enough and properly shaped to receive them. They are the agents, he said, of all sensation.

The reader of Lucretius and of Epicurus' *Letter to Herodotus* (Diogenes Laertius x) will recognize in Boyle's streams of particles a fairly accurate copy of the ἀπόρροιαί of the Epicurean physics, which were said to flow off from all things and to cause sensation. From all things, said Epicurus, there constantly flow off outlines (τύποι) or drafts, sketches, or films. These travel at great speed, and because of their extreme thinness encounter little or no opposition from other bodies, but almost always find a passage of the proper shape and small enough to let them through (πόρον σύμμετρον).⁴ The outlines, which Epicurus also called idols or images (εἰδῶλα), retain the figure of the object whence they flow, and by a constant streaming into the pores of the eye they construct the φαντασία or vision which we see. Considered collectively, the idols are called a something which flows off (ἀπόρροια)⁵

³ Cf. Robert Boyle, *Works* (London, 1772), III, 682, 704.

⁴ Diogenes Laertius x. 47.

⁵ *Ibid.* 46.

or a stream (*ῥεῖσις* or *ῥεῖμα*). The idols, like all things in the Epicurean system, are material; so when the philosopher referred to the composition of the *effluvium* or stream, he naturally called the *particles* of it bodies (*σώματα*) or masses (*ὄγκοι*).

By corporeal *effluxions* or *effluvia* Epicurus explained not only vision but the other sensations as well. Of hearing and smelling he wrote to Herodotus as follows:

Again, hearing takes place when a current passes from the object, whether person or thing, which emits voice or sound or noise, or produces the sensation of hearing in any way whatever. This current [*ῥεῖμα*] is broken up into homogeneous particles [*ὄγκοι*], which at the same time preserve a certain mutual connexion and a distinctive unity extending to the object which emitted them, and thus, for the most part, cause the perception in that case, or, if not, merely indicate the presence of the external object. . . . The blow which is struck in us when we utter a sound causes such a displacement of the particles [*ὄγκοι*] as serves to produce a current [*ῥεῖμα*] resembling breath, and this displacement gives rise to the sensation of hearing.

Again, we must believe that smelling, like hearing, would produce no sensation, were there not particles [*ὄγκοι*] conveyed from the object which are of the proper sort for exciting the organ of smelling, some of one sort, some of another, some exciting it confusedly and strangely, others quietly and agreeably.⁶

The skeptical reader of Epicurus must immediately inquire why it is that the objects which send off the *effluvia* of their idols into our eyes do not waste away until their whole substance has flowed forth. Epicurus answers that the bombardment of atoms from the surrounding air on to the surface of bodies restores them: "For particles are continually streaming off from the surface of bodies, though no diminution of the bodies is observed, because other particles take their place."⁷ This statement suggests what Epicurus has implied elsewhere as well, that the minute bodily images (which he referred to interchangeably as *εἰδῶλα*, *τύποι*, *σώματα*, and *ὄγκοι*) are composed of atoms.⁸ But the philosopher always spoke of the images as single

⁶ *Ibid.* 52-53; trans. R. D. Hicks ("Loeb Library" [London, 1925]), II, 583.

⁷ *Ibid.*, x, 48.

⁸ Mr. Cyril Bailey comments that Epicurus is vague concerning the idols. Clearly they are the rinds or peelings of the object, and they have parts corresponding to the surface which we see. But Epicurus does not explain how the rind of a table 4 by 3 feet shrinks in size so as to enter the pupil of the eye. Furthermore, he is not specific about the size of the idol in comparison with that of an atom. Atoms, of course, are of different sizes, and it appears from one or two statements that the idols are composed of very thin atoms, which retain a mutual relationship corresponding to that of the object seen (cf. *Greek*

entities, referring to them as thin material bodies or masses; and this, for our purposes, is specific enough. These bodies, he said, flow off in a corporeal effluvium.

Lucretius, his disciple, employed the same conception of a material off-flow to describe the mystery of sensation of objects distant from us.⁹ The particles causing sensation, he said, go to their proper places because their peculiar shapes fit only into the pores prepared for them;¹⁰ and the movements of these particles from sensible objects to our eyes, ears, nose, and tongue are the subject of almost two-thirds of Lucretius' fourth book. The *simulacrum*, said the poet, is like a

atomista [Oxford, 1928], pp. 411 ff.). The idols, says Epicurus, are "of a thinness far exceeding that of any object that we see" (Diogenes Laertius x. 46; trans. Hicks). "However delicate the structure they leave," says Mr. Bailey, "they are merely its surface atoms, 'skimmed,' as it were, from the whole" (*ibid.*, p. 408). But Lucretius, who was a faithful expositor of his master's principles, argues for the existence of the idols by their analogy to atoms in general, referring to the many tiny bodies on the surface of things (*multa minuta*, IV, 67), and demonstrates their thinness by allusion to the thinness of the *primordia* (IV, 110-15). Again, the swift movement of the idols (*simulacra*) in *De rerum natura* is shown by their analogy to the *prima minuta* or atoms of light and heat which come from the sun (IV, 183-88). But Mr. Cyril Bailey's opinion that the images are composed of several atoms has nothing to confute it, and gives a plausible meaning to the usages of both the philosopher and the poet.

Thomas Stanley, who simplified philosophical problems for himself as well as for his large public in the seventeenth century, had no doubt at all as to Epicurus' meaning on this point. "These Images, by reason of the tenuity we spoke of, being nothing else but certain contextures of simple Atoms, 'have a celerity beyond all imagination'" (*History of philosophy* [1655-62], [3d ed.; London, 1701], p. 585). Only the phrase about the speed of the idols is quoted from Diogenes Laertius.

⁹ "Principio omnibus ab rebus, quascumque videmus,
perpetuo fluere ac mitti spargique necessest
corpora quae feriant oculos visumque lacessant.
Perpetuoque fluunt certis ab rebus odores;
frigus ut a fluviis, calor ab sole, aestus ab undis
aequoris exesor moerorum litora propter.
Nec varii cessant sonitus manare per auras.
Denique in os salsi venit umor saepe saporis,
cum mare versamur propter, dilutaque contra
cum tulumur misceri absinthia, tangit amaror.
Usque adeo omnibus ab rebus res quaeque fluenter
fertur et in cunctas dimittitur undique partis,
nec mora nec requies interdatur ulla fluendi,
perpetuo quoniam sentimus, et omnia semper
cernere odorari licet et sentire sonare."

(*De rerum natura* vi. 921-35)

¹⁰ "Multa foramina cum varilis sint reddita rebus,
dissimili inter se natura praedita debent
esse et habere suam naturam quaeque viasque.
Quippe etenim varii sensus animantibus insunt,
quorum quisque suam proprie rem percipit in se.
Nam penetrare alio sonitus alioque saporem
cernimus e sucis, alio nidoris odores."

(*Ibid.*, 981-87)

film (*membrana*)¹¹ or a rind (*cortex*)¹² of a thing, the likeness of which (*effigies*) a whole stream of *simulacra* presents to the organ of sense.¹³ Like the εἰδῶλα, *simulacra* are bodies (*corpora*)¹⁴ which stream off at very great speed and move freely through the air. Like the images of Epicurus, the images of Lucretius are probably composed of atoms, but are nevertheless exceedingly thin and swift and difficult to hinder. They fly forth everywhere, enter into pores (*foramina*),¹⁵ and cause all sensation.

Let us examine some of these Greek and Latin terms. 'Ἀπόρροια is the technical word of pre-Socratic atomism representing the effluence of particles to the eye to cause sight.¹⁶ Like the ancient atomists, Epicurus indicated by ἀπόρροια the thing which flows.¹⁷ By ρεῦμα and ρεῦσις he meant the same.¹⁸ 'Ρεῦμα means a 'flood'; ρεῦσις normally means a 'flowing,' but Epicurus gives to it also the specific meaning of the thing that does the flowing.¹⁹ Obviously all three nouns are related to the verb ῥέω, meaning to 'flow,' 'run,' 'stream,' or 'gush.' The τύποι or εἰδῶλα which compose the ἀπόρροιαί, said Epicurus, are ὄγκοι or σώματα. If these are composite bodies, they are obviously made up of ἄτομοι.²⁰

Lucretius called the ἄτομοι *primordia*, *principia*, *corpuscula*, *particula*, and *semina*,²¹ and the words τύποι and εἰδῶλα he translated *simulacra*, *imagines*, *species*, *formae*, and *effigiae*.²² Thus for all the particles within the material off-flow except the atom itself Lucretius used the important Latin words which were to serve the purposes of

¹¹ *Iv.* 35.

¹² *Iv.* 50.

¹³ "Dico igitur rerum effigias tenuisque figuras mittit ab rebus summo de corpore rerum, quae quasi membranae vel cortex nominantur, quod speciem ac formam similem gerit eius imago cuiuscumque cluet de corpore fusa vagari."

(*De rerum natura* *iv.* 46–52)

¹⁴ *Ibid.* *vi.* 923.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* 981.

¹⁶ Empedocles taught this theory of sensation (cf. Bailey, p. 53).

¹⁷ Diogenes Laertius *x.* 46.

¹⁸ Cf. *ibid.* 48, 49, 52, 53, 99.

¹⁹ Cf. *ibid.* 48.

²⁰ On Epicurus' failure to explain fully the ὄγκοι and the likeness of these composed bodies to molecules cf. Katharine C. Reiley, *Studies in the philosophical terminology of Lucretius and Cicero* (New York, 1909), pp. 40–43.

²¹ Epicurus had used the equivalent of *semina*, σπέρματα (cf. *ibid.*, p. 55). Cicero used *atomus*, but Lucretius never did. The poet introduced very few Greek words into Latin; and this one, in some of its cases, would have disturbed his meter (cf. *ibid.*, pp. 7 ff., 63).

²² Cf. *ibid.*, p. 17.

Renaissance atomism. Unlike Cicero, Lucretius did not use *atomus*; but that important word, too, was made current in the first century B.C.²³ The terms *effluuium*, *effluxio*, and *emissio* are not to be found in the technical vocabulary of first-century atomism. Cicero translated *ἀπόρροια* by *transitio* and *accessio*; Lucretius used *aestus*.²⁴ The last, of course, is fairly accurate, for it designates a seething tide and has a metaphorical value; but *aestus* has not the general connotation of Epicurus' word.

Why did not Lucretius translate *ἀπόρροια* with *effluuium* as the Renaissance naturalists were to do? The first written record of *effluuium* is from the century after Lucretius.²⁵ Why did not the poet, attentive to the possibilities of his own tongue, introduce *effluuium* into literature? Lucretius did use forms related to the word employed so naturally during the Renaissance. For instance, he used the verb *fluere* to indicate the action of the *corpora* which stream from visible objects and cause sight;²⁶ he also used *effluere*;²⁷ and the magnetical fluid thought of as a wave he indicated by the noun, *fluctus*. Furthermore, although perhaps because of his meter, he did not use the term so common in Renaissance atomism, *emissio*,²⁸ Lucretius did use *emissum*.²⁹

Even in the general literary Latin of the Renaissance *effluuium* and *effluxio* were unimportant words, and Estienne did not list them in the first edition of his great dictionary.³⁰ True, if Sennert, Digby, Charle-ton, or Robert Boyle looked for these terms of modern atomism in the enlarged second edition of Estienne (4 v. folio [London, 1573]), they

²³ Cicero defined it as follows: *Ille atomos, quas appellat, id est corpora individua propter soliditatem* (*De finibus* I. 6. 17).

²⁴ Lucretius applies *aestus* to the *semina* which flow (*fluere*) from the lodestone (iv, 1002-4; cf. also 1056-57).

²⁵ Pliny the Elder and Tacitus used *effluuium*. *Effluxio* is not suitable to the hexameters of *De rerum natura*, but *effluuium* is.

²⁶ vi. 922.

²⁷ vi. 791-95; in vi. 521, *effluere* applies to the rain falling out of the clouds.

²⁸ *Emissio* also was rare in classical Latin, but Cicero used it for 'a letting go,' i.e., with its general connotation, not specifically related to atomism.

²⁹ He makes unique use, says Harpers' *Lexicon* (s.v.), of the noun form *emissum*. The word does not mean the thing discharged but the discharging. Lucretius indicated by it the sending-off of the very subtle *simulacra* (iv. 205).

³⁰ *Dictionarium, seu Latinae linguae thesaurus* (Paris, 1536). It is a treasury, of course, of classical words. Nevertheless it was for the use of elegant speakers and writers.

did find *effluvium* and the related form *effluentia*. But here are the entries in the dictionary:

Effluentia, huius effluentiae [*ἐκροή*] Plin. lib. 26. cap. 10, Illita quoque radix genitalibus, inhibet non solum Venerum, sed effluentiam geniturae, hoc est seminis in somno effusionem.

Effluvium, *effluyii* [*ἐκρυσς*] Plin. lib. 7. cap. 51, Profundi humoris e corpore effluvium.

Effluvium lacus, quo exundat, & se exonerat. Tacit. lib. 12,³¹ Quin & convivium effluvio lacus appositum magna formidine cunctos effecit: quia vis aquarum erumpens proxima trahebat, &c.

Effluence for Pliny the Elder (first century A.D.) was a seminal emission; the *effluvium* was a flow of water or moisture from the body or the outlet of a lake. The former meaning of *effluvium* (*umoris e corpore*), indeed, was a fairly common first-century connotation. Besides Pliny, Tacitus and P. Velleius Paterculus (a historian who flourished A.D. 30) gave *effluvium* this meaning and specifically applied the word to the overflow of urine or of matter from the bowels and brain as death approaches.³²

These first-century meanings of *effluvium* persisted during the Middle Ages; and in that period *effluctio* had an equally unpleasant connotation. Augustine had used the form *effluxio* to indicate the off-flow of blood from the body,³³ and Cassiodorus had used the conception of *sanguinis effluxio* for theological purposes.³⁴ *Effluctio* is not recorded as a classical word;³⁵ Du Cange, however, quotes it from a charter of 1330. The definition is

Effluctio: Effluentia, eluvies, difluvium. Charta Ann. 1330 in Reg. 66. Chartoph. reg. ch. 425: Ut cloacae purgentur et Effluctiones illarum.³⁶

³¹ I.e., *Annales* xii. 57.

³² Cf. Harpers' *Lexicon*, s.v.

³³ In *Ps.* 140:4.

³⁴ Christ was born, says Cassiodorus, "Non ex non exstante, sed ex exstante Patre; non secundum corporum similitudines incisionibus, aut divisionum effluxionibus . . ." (*Historia tripartita* I. 14; Migne, LXIX, 911D). In Servius' *Commentary on Vergil*, *effluxio* indicates the platonistic emanation from the heavens: "Quod et Plato videtur astruere qui dicit, quod cum de effluxione fontium non aliarum quarumlibet rerum, sed ipsarum stellarum, fuerint animae corporibus commodandae, quicquid de ipsis fontibus stellarum ebullit, hoc intellegi debere stellas" (On Aeneid xi. 51; Thilo et Hagen [Leipsic, 1881-87], II, 483).

³⁵ That is, not by the *Theaurus linguae Latinae* (Leipsic, 1900—).

³⁶ *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis* (Paris, 1883-87), s.v. The first edition of Du Cange appeared at Paris in 1678, but *effluctio* did not appear until Carpenter's supplement (Paris, 1766).

An *eluvies* is a washing-away of impurities, a flowing-off, a discharge. The most common meaning of *cloaca* is an artificial canal built in Rome to carry sewage and the filth of the streets into the Tiber.³⁷ That general verb of flowing-off which we found in Lucretius, *effluere*, had perhaps a more attractive meaning than *effluctio* in the Middle Ages, but the Du Cange supplement records a connotation still displeasing to some people: "*Effluere, A virtute deflectere, Viam virtutis deserere.*"

Le Sieur Charles DuFresne du Cange (1610-88) was a contemporary of Sir Thomas Browne, and his *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae & infimae Latinitas* appeared while Sir Thomas was still alive (Paris, 1678), though not early enough for Browne to use it in any of the works which he himself published.³⁸ Du Cange's treatment of our words, however, would not be without interest, for it would show what the medieval and vulgar Latin usages meant to a learned contemporary of Sir Thomas. But in the first and second editions of the *Glossarium* neither *effluvium* nor any of its cognates appeared.³⁹ From this fact I infer that a French scholar living in the seventeenth century did not find the *effluvium* words very important. Apparently their significance was restricted to the new natural science.

Ficino's use of *effluxio* in the fifteenth century suggests that this is true. When translating the *Timaeus* (considered a scientific work), Ficino used the word much as the seventeenth-century natural philosophers were to use it. Plato said that both ingress into the body and egress from it are necessary; but *egressum*, he said, is more pleasing, especially the *verborum effluxio*.⁴⁰ Here *effluxio* is still from the body, but the word is no longer restricted to bodily excretions.

The theory that natural philosophy produced the modern words *effluvium*, *effluctio*, and *emissio* is further supported by the appearance of two of them in the scientific works of Fracastorius. In truth, the pages of this great Italian physician and humanist show the relation-

³⁷ No doubt the specific physiological meanings of *effluvium* made it inappropriate for Lucretius' use.

³⁸ The last works published in his lifetime were *Hydriotaphia* and *Garden of Cyrus* (1658).

³⁹ I have been unable to examine the rare first edition of this work (Paris, 1678), but I have consulted the second (Frankfort, 1681), and it is a fair assumption that everything in the first appeared in the second edition.

⁴⁰ "Verborum autem effluxio ministra praedentiae, effluxionum omnium optima est atque pulcherrima" (*Platonis opera a Marsilio Ficino traducta* [Paris, 1518], Vol. II, fol. CCXCVIII).

ship of both words and ideas, on the one hand, to Renaissance science and, on the other, to ancient atomism. Fracastorius knew the poem of Lucretius well, as the external circumstances of his life would lead one to expect. The *De rerum natura* had been practically lost during the Dark and Middle ages,⁴¹ but in 1414 the classical sleuth, Poggio Bracciolini, found a manuscript of it in Germany, and in 1473 an edition was made at Brescia. Ten years later the poem was reprinted in Verona, and in 1516 it was prepared for the Aldine press by the fellow-student and lifelong friend of Fracastorius, Andrea Naugerius.⁴² Fracastorius' great book, *De contagione* (1546), used many Lucretian conceptions; let us consider some of his Lucretian words. Germs he sometimes called *parva particula*, describing their hardness and other properties as the Epicurean poet had done.⁴³ Like Lucretius, he said that the distant action of garlic, pepper, and saffron upon the senses to produce weeping, sneezing, and sleep is due to the exhalation of *insensibilia corpora* from these substances. Evaporation, he said, is into *minimas et non ultra divisibiles partes*.⁴⁴ Contagion, he said, originates in the imperceptible particles (*particulas vero minimas et insensibiles*) out of which composition and mixture occur (*ex quibus compositio fit, et mistio*).⁴⁵

Finally, in his account of the magnet, Fracastorius named "our" Lucretius and explained the atomic theory of the lodestone. But here he did not use the Lucretian words; instead he used the very word which the seventeenth century was to use in translating Epicurus' ἀπόρροιαί! "*Antiqui quidem, ut Democritus & Epicurus, quos e nostris Lucretius secutus est, effluxiones corporum quas Athomos appellabant.*"⁴⁶ In the same passage Fracastorius wrote, using Lucretian language, "*a rebus effluent insensibilia corpora*"; but he also repeated

⁴¹ Bede, it is true, spoke of atoms, and in Leyden there remains a ninth-century manuscript of the *De rerum natura* made at Mainz in the see of Hrabanus Maurus. Hrabanus referred to his own writings on the atom (cf. G. B. Stones, "The atomic view of matter in the XVth, XVIth, and XVIIth centuries," *Isis*, X, 445 ff.).

⁴² Cf. Hieronymus Fracastorius *De contagione et contagiosis morbis et eorum curatione*, ed. W. C. Wright (New York, 1930), pp. 310 (xvii. xli. 1). Fracastorius honored his friend posthumously by putting into his mouth his own ideas *de poetica: Naugerius sive de Poetica*. Cf. also Fracastorius' affectionate reference to Naugerius in *De contagione* ii. 6.

⁴³ Cf. *De contagione*, ed. Wright, p. 30.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* p. 4.

⁴⁶ *De sympathia*, in *Opera* (Venice, 1574), fol. 60 C^v.

the modern Epicurean *Athomorum effluxionibus*. Perhaps he had more direct access to Epicurus than the Lucretian interpretation. At any rate, he used our word and linked it with the atoms of Democritus, Epicurus, and Lucretius. His book on sympathies, from which these phrases are taken, treated the magnet experimentally, for he believed in observation; and he found it necessary to explain all attractions rather by a semisubstantial *species spirituales* than by *effluxiones athomorum*. So, in their early appearance, the Renaissance effluxions were connected not only with Epicurus but also with the new study of nature.

Fracastorius assigned both the new atomistic meaning to *effluxio* and the old physiological one as well, speaking, for instance, of the *sanguinis . . . effluxio per nares*;⁴⁷ he likewise employed *emissio* in its old physiological sense: *seminis emissio*⁴⁸ and *urinae emissio*.⁴⁹ According to Robert Estienne (*Thesaurus*, 1536), *emissio* from classical times had a more general meaning, signifying the thing thrown, such as the missile projected by an engine of war;⁵⁰ but I have not found this more general use of *emissio* in Fracastorius nor any special use of it in connection with atomic theory. Also, so far as I have looked in his works I have not found the word *effluvium*.

The later Renaissance naturalists, however, spoke of Fracastorius' *effluxio athomorum* as an *effluvium athomorum*. In the following sentences of Pierre Gassendi, for example, the ἀπόρροια, the effluxion of atoms, the effluvium, Fracastorius' account of these, and the Italian physician's *species spirituales* are all brought together. Gassendi has surveyed the various interpretations of the Democritean theory of magnetic attraction, and he concludes:

Subiungit etiam opinionem Democriti idem referentis ad effluxiones atomorum, quae in magnete similes quidem, sed tenuiores tamen iis, quae in ferro sint; ac ideo ferri meatus subeuntes ejus atomos stimulent; ipsis autem versus magnetem effluentibus, tum ob similitudinem, tum ob uberius in ipso vacuum, tota ferri massa effluvio cohaerens una transferatur. Cohaeret cum istis ex parte Platonis sententia;⁵¹ tametsi enim ille videatur non satis perspicue sese explicare, ex Plutarchi⁵² tamen interpretatione admisit

⁴⁷ *De contagione*, ed. Wright, p. 106.

⁴⁸ *De sympathia*, in *Opera* (1574), fol. 69 Ar.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, fol. 69 Br.

⁵⁰ Cf. Cicero, *Tusc.* ii. 24. 57 and *De divin.* ii. 29. 62.

⁵¹ "In *Tim.*" (Gassendi's note).

⁵² "In *quaest. Plat.*" (Gassendi's note).

quoque ἀπόρροιας, effluxiones quasdam; a quibus aër magneti vicinus in orbem propulsus, dum redit ad impediendum vacuum, secum una corripit ferrum. Corripiat, inquam, ob meatus, qui sunt in illo, quam in auro, lapide, aliisque rebus seu densioribus, seu laxioribus commensuratiores. Sic Ficinus⁵³ quoque recentior exposuit; Fracastorius autem, cum effluvia quoque atomorum non abnuat, censet tamen ferri motionem versus magnetem fieri, non ut vacuum impediatur, sed ut emotae oculis suis particulae connaturalem⁵⁴ obtineant situm; quod dum nituntur, sua quoque subjecta continentia moveant.⁵⁵

For the Epicurean philosopher, Gassendi, both *effluxions* and *effluvia* were ἀπόρροιαι; and the terms were synonymous for seventeenth-century natural philosophers generally. Thus Boyle, referring to Fracastorius' theory of contagion, said that diseases are "conveyed by insensible effluvia";⁵⁶ and a contemporary of Browne's, Thomas Jackson, said, "Some . . . deny all effluxions from objects sensible."⁵⁷

Emission also signified to the seventeenth century the ἀπόρροια. Sir Thomas Browne spoke of "emissions" from "bodies electrical";⁵⁸ and his admirer and friend, Dr. Henry Power, said, "Magnetical Emissions are . . . Corporeal Atoms."⁵⁹ But there is confusion here, for Browne's emission is a continued *effluvium* like a string of syrup, and Power's is a *particle*. It is a confusion which was never resolved, and even Robert Boyle used the term *effluvium* ambiguously. He sometimes signified the aura about the lodestone by that word; sometimes the particles within the aura.⁶⁰ The ambiguity in the meanings

⁵³ "In Tim. cap. v." Unfortunately Ficino's "Compendium in Timaeum," cap. v (Platonis opera a Marsilio Ficino traducta [Paris, 1518], fol. CCLXXVr) does not use the same vocabulary as Fracastorius had used. Thus Ficino gives no further clue to the usages of *effluvium* and *effluxio* in relation to the lodestone. Neither in this chapter of the commentary nor in his translation of *Timaeus* 80 B-C (trans. Ficino [1518], fol. CCXCIXr), where Plato refers to the "Heracleian stone," does Ficinus employ these words.

⁵⁴ I doubt if Fracastoro would allow that his immaterial *species spirituales* are *particulae*. Gassendi's account of Fracastoro's opinions here appears to be like that of Bruno, a misrepresentation of the Italian physician as a natural philosopher more corpuscular and atomistic than he really was.

⁵⁵ *Syntagma philosophicum*, Pars II, Sectio III, Membrum I, Lib. III, Cap. iv, in *Opera omnia* (Florence, 1727), II, 107.

⁵⁶ *The usefulness of experimental philosophy*, II (Oxford, 1671), 244.

⁵⁷ The *Oxford English dictionary* quotes this from *Commentaries on the creed*, V, cxliii, giving the date ca. 1630. The *Commentaries* were published in eleven "Books" (London, 1613-57). *OED* defines the concrete meanings of *effluxion* by means of the synonym *effluvium*, and quotes Sir Francis Bacon: "There are . . . some Light Effluxions from spirit to spirit" (*Sylva sylvarum* [1626], § 941).

⁵⁸ II, W. 340.

⁵⁹ *Experimental philosophy* (London, 1664), p. 155.

⁶⁰ When Boyle used *effluvium* in the singular he meant the whole quantity of things which flow off considered as one, and this meaning is explained in Professor Fulton's note on Boyle's *Essays of effluvia*: "The term 'effluvium,' which nowadays is seldom seen,

of *effluvium* is even worse than that, for Boyle and all the other Corpuscularians thought that the *effluvium* of the magnet is particulate while that of amber (which causes electric attraction) is continuous; but to the off-flow from each they applied the words *effluvium*, *effluxion* and *emission*.⁶¹

refers to the sphere of influence of a solid body, e.g. lodestone; it was imagined that it emitted particles, and this particulate aura was termed an *effluvium*" (J. F. Fulton, "A bibliography of Robert Boyle," *Oxford Bibliographical Society proceedings and papers*, III, Part I, 74). The Latin plural of the word also connotes the whole aura or stream when in *Essays of effluvia* Boyle says: "The effluvia of bodies may consist of particles extremely small"; and he attached the same meaning to the anglicized plural, *effluvia*. On the other hand, *effluvia* might indicate separate particles, as in the following passage: "I remember, that to help some friends conceive how such extremely-minute particles as Magnetical *effluvia*, may, by pervading a hard and solid body, such as Iron, put its insensible Corpuscles into motion, and thereby range them in a new manner, . . ." (*An essay of the great effects of even languid and unheeded motion* [Oxford, 1685], p. 39). Nowhere have I found Boyle using the singular form *effluvium* to designate a single particle; the *effluvium* seems to be always the stream or aura; *effluvia* and *effluvia*, on the other hand, are sometimes streams and sometimes corpuscles in the stream. That is, Boyle's word *effluvia* indicates now the Epicurean *πύκνῃς*, *πύκνῃς*, and *ἀνόρροιαί* and now the *σάματα* and *δύκνοι*. One reason for Boyle's ambiguity here is his refusal to define the single particle which flows off. Is it an atom or merely a corpuscle? Epicurus, for different reasons, also left the *σάματα* and *εἰσβολὰν* undefined; and it is impossible for scholars to tell exactly what is the structure of the Epicurean idol. But for both Epicurus and Boyle the precise nature of the particle which flows off (Epicurus' particle causing sensation, Boyle's causing, *inter alia*, sensation and magnetic action) was not so important as the fact that the off-flow was material and particulate.

In the ancient Epicurean writings the most specific account of the shape of the atoms or bulks which make up the *effluvium* applied to the *effluvia* of sound. The idols in the *effluvia* of the trumpet, said Lucretius, are sharp; those sent forth by the swan when she sings are smooth and round (*De rerum natura* iv. 523 ff.). Thomas Stanley, on the lookout always for whatever would make philosophy graphic, elaborated the teaching of Epicurus about voice, which remained in the Epicurean fragments, with the more specific descriptions of Plutarch. The following is extracted from Stanley's chapter "Of Hearing":

"Hearing . . . is perform'd 'in the Ear by an emission of something, convey'd thither from the thing that speaks, sounds, makes a noise, or is some other way disposed to stir up the sense of hearing.' This kind of effluvium, as it affects this sense, is called Sound.

"Moreover, this *effluvium*, either in the mouth of the Speaker, or generally in the thing struck upon and making a noise, is shatter'd there by motion into innumerable little pieces of the same figure, (rounded, if the whole effluvium were round; inequilateral and triangular, if the first effluvium were such,) in like manner as we observe, that little drops are made when we pour any thing out of bottles, or when Cloath-workers spurt water upon their cloaths.

" . . . As soon as ever the blow is made within us when we speak, the voice being articulated out of certain little pieces, of a most spiritual and nimble effluxion, fit for the Office, and arriving at the Ear, causeth hearing in us" (pp. 586-87).

The quotations are from Diogenes Laertius; the paragraph between is from Plutarch's *De placitis philosophorum* iv. 19. Although the extant remains of Epicurus do not specifically indicate inequilateral and triangular particles in the *effluvia*, the philosopher's *Letter to Herodotus* does say that the current of sound (*πύκνῃς*) is split up into "particles like, as parts, to the whole" (*ἁμοιομερεῖς δύκνοις*) (cf. Diogenes Laertius x. 52-53; Cyril Bailey, *Epicurus, the extant remains* [Oxford, 1926], p. 199, n. 8).

⁶¹ Not only the meanings, but the forms, of *effluvium* were chaotic in the seventeenth century. Browne, Boyle, and others said *effluvium*, *effluvia*, and *effluvia*. The *Oxford English dictionary* notices a double plural, *effluvias*, and even *effluviae*. Examples of the former are: "1652 French *Yorksh. Spa.* xvii. 120 Subtile insensible spirits, or rather atomes and effluvia's. 1692 Norris *Curs. Refl.* 24 Tell me how these corporeal effluvia . . . enter the eye."

Of one thing, however, we may be sure: to Sir Thomas Browne and his more modern contemporaries the *effluvium* of natural philosophy was always something material. For example, the atomistic philosopher, Jean Chrisostome Magnen, praised Democritus in the following terms:

Effluvia Corporum Atomosque comperit, & invexit omnium primus: ex Laertio quod unum tanti apud me est, ut congestas omnium Philosophorum laudes vel exaequet vel superet.⁶²

The passage is quoted by Walter Charleton while discussing the etymology of the word *atom*. The honor of first using it, says Charleton, belongs to "one Moschus, a Phoenician, who flourished not long before the ruine of Troy by the Grecians." And to correct Magnenus, Charleton says that not Democritus but Leucippus is accredited by Diogenes Laertius with comparing the *effluvia* of bodies to atoms.⁶³

The material *effluvium* as a continued "thread" and "enlengthened filament" is Sir Thomas Browne's agent of electric attraction. Browne's exposition of it draws upon similar demonstrations by Cabeus, Digby, Descartes, and Gilbert, especially the last, whom Sir Thomas Browne quotes as follows:

Effluvia illa tenuiora concipiunt et amplectuntur corpora, quibus uniuntur, et electricis tanquam extensis brachiis, et ad fontem propinquitate invalescentibus effluviis, deducuntur.

Gilbert had said that the corporeal *effluvium* of amber has the force and likeness of a rarefied humor,⁶⁴ since it is the very stuff out of which the amber was originally made.⁶⁵ It is like a *spiritus* or breath, he said,⁶⁶ and may be compared to material rods (*materiales radii*).⁶⁷ Air, also, according to Gilbert, is an *effluvium*—"Aër, qui est universalis huius globi telluris effluvium," he said.⁶⁸ These effluvia of Gilbert are closely related to the *Spiritus mundi* which arose out of the Stoical

⁶² Quoted from Magnen's *Democritus reviviscens, sive vita et philosophia Democriti* (1646) by Walter Charleton in *Physiologia, Epicuro—Gassendo—Charltoniana: or a fabrick of science natural, upon the hypothesis of atoms, founded by Epicurus, repaired by Petrus Gassendus, augmented by Walter Charleton* (London, 1654), p. 87.

⁶³ Charleton, p. 87. Giordano Bruno, writing at the end of the sixteenth century, discussed the *ἀεὶρ*, calling it *effluxus*, *influxus*, or *fluxus atomorum* (cf. *De maximo et immenso* II. 5; *Opera Latine conscripta* [Naples, 1897], Book I, chap. I, p. 272; also *ibid.*, chap. III, pp. 200 ff.

⁶⁴ *De magnete* (London, 1600), p. 59.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 60.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

physiology, but Gilbert was familiar with the Epicurean physics also,⁶⁹ and it is probable that his conception of the corporeal off-flow was assisted by the particulate theories of Epicurus, Lucretius, and Fracastorius. He rejected the Epicurean theories because they involve a material account of magnetic coition, and he could satisfactorily explain his own experiments only by saying that the earth, the heavenly bodies, and magnets all have souls.⁷⁰ But it is important to notice that all the *effluvia* which Gilbert did accept (especially that from amber) are material ones.

On first reading Nicola Cabeo's *Philosophia magnetica* (1629) one has the impression that the Italian Jesuit denied that the word *effluvium* indicates a material thing, but when the reader looks more closely at Cabeo's assertion that the *effluvium* of the magnet is neither atomic nor spiritous but a quality, he sees that Cabeo merely used the term more loosely than Gilbert did. To Gilbert *effluvium* indicated a thing so physical that he would not use the term to describe his special "magnetic forms" which go forth and draw the iron. Cabeo, on the other hand, was willing to call his immaterial agent of magnetism an *effluvium*, but in doing so he found it necessary to say that it is an insubstantial one.⁷¹ Like Boyle, Cabeo used *effluvium* in two senses: it signified now the aura around the lodestone, now the things which make up the aura. When he said that the *effluvium* is not atoms or anything substantial⁷² Cabeo meant by *effluvium* literally the thing which flows off, whatever it may be. But when he went on to say that the *effluvium* is not borne by an *effluvium* (*nec tenui vehatur effluvio*) the first *effluvium* is what composes the aura—in Cabeo's opinion a quality and consequently spiritual; the second is a material thing like the electric effluvium (*tenuis spiritus*) which Gilbert described.⁷³ Cabeo was willing to confuse the meanings of *effluvium* in his sophist-

⁶⁹ He said that the atomists teach that *ex omnibus rebus minutissima corpora effluant* (*ibid.*, p. 3).

⁷⁰ Gilbert's objections to the Lucretian account of magnetism show that he did not understand the Epicurean physics. He said that if, as Lucretius taught, particles stream off from the magnet, opening a channel in the air through which the iron will be pushed by atoms shoving from behind, the magnet would soon be dissolved (*cf. ibid.*, II, iii).

⁷¹ *Philosophia magnetica* (Ferrara, 1629), p. 119.

⁷² *Not minutissimae atomi, nor corpuscula exigua, nor tenuis spiritus* (*ibid.*).

⁷³ The *effluvium* (quality) is not borne by an *effluvium* (material rod or substantial spiritus), said Cabeo, but by an off-flow itself almost incorporeal (*pene dixerim incorporeum*) (*ibid.*).

ries upon the delicate philosophical question of the medium of magnetism, for the nature of body and spirit was involved, and to be too exact in the natural philosophy of this question was to invite "the frown of theology." But in treating the electric he was on safer ground; the *effluvium* of amber, he thought, is without question material.⁷⁴

By way of the half-atomistic theories of Descartes and Digby, the *effluvia* of magnetism became particulate. Said Sir Thomas Browne:

Now, whether these effluviūms do fly by striated atoms and winding particles, as Renatus des Cartes conceiveth, or glide by streams attracted from either pole and hemisphere of the earth unto the equator, as Sir Kenelm Digby excellently declareth, it takes not away this virtue of the earth; but more distinctly sets down the gēsts and progress thereof.⁷⁵

And this meaning of the word *effluvium* is defined by the *Oxford dictionary* as follows: "A stream of minute particles formerly supposed to be emitted by a magnet, electrified body, or other attracting or repelling agent, and to be the means by which it produces its effects."⁷⁶

Effluvium, *effluxion*, *emission*—all three words signified to the seventeenth-century scientists a material something which flows off. The words apparently acquired their general scientific meanings during the Renaissance, when they were applied to two traditional conceptions of the material off-flow: the Stoical *spiritus* or breath and the Epicurean stream of particles. It is true that the idea of a threadlike material *effluvium* of the amber persisted even in the philosophy of Robert Boyle; but Fracastorius, Gassendi, Magnenus, and most of the seventeenth-century scientists except Gilbert and Cabeus associated the terms more especially with the particulate off-flow.

By Boyle's time, in truth, the particulate *effluvia* were far more important than the continuous ones; indeed, they assisted in producing

⁷⁴ The *effluvium* of amber could be interrupted by moisture, but a stone wall could not prevent the mysterious activity of the lodestone. To call the magnetic medium material was to destroy the orthodox ideas of matter.

⁷⁵ II. W. 286.

⁷⁶ *OED* first illustrates this definition from *Pseudodoxia epidemica*. Its definition of *effluvium* meaning "An 'exhalation' affecting the sense of smell" is first illustrated from the translation of Hobbes's *Elements of philosophy* (1656). That an odor is an *effluvium* was an idea commonly put forth in the Latin writings of the time, and Sir Thomas Browne indicated that meaning of *effluvium* in 1650 when in the second edition of *Vulgar errors* he used the phrase "effluvium or odor of steel" (II. W. 403). *Pseudodoxia*, according to *OED*, shows early significant usages of *effluence*, *effluency*, and *emission*, as well as *effluvium*.

the fruitful Corpuscularian philosophy. Thus the prophecy of Sir Thomas Browne was already proving true:

And truly the doctrine of effluxions, their penetrating natures, their invisible paths, and unsuspected effects, are very considerable; for, besides this magnetical one of the earth, several effusions there may be from divers other bodies, which invisibly act their parts at any time, and, perhaps, through any medium; a part of philosophy but yet in discovery, and will, I fear, prove the last leaf to be turned over in the book of nature.⁷⁷

Sir Thomas has just defined *effluvioms* as composed of either the "striated atoms and winding particles" of Descartes or the gliding atoms of Sir Kenelm Digby; so there can be no doubt as to their particulate nature.

If any doubt still persists on this point, perhaps one more bit of evidence will allay it. In the *Pseudodoxia* Sir Thomas investigates the possibility of the emission of *effluvioms* without abatement of weight—clearly a vital problem of Renaissance atomism. He considers the *effluvioms* of potable gold, stibium or the antimonial cup, diamonds, sapphire, lodestone, and bodies electrical. All these substances were believed to exert influence, and the new materialistic physiology (i.e., physics) attempted to say that they do so by means of material *effluvia*. The same was said of amulets (Boyle, be it remembered, wore "some moss from a dead man's skull" and cured a hemorrhage!):

Thirdly, if amulets do work by emanations from their bodies, upon those parts whereunto they are appended, and are not yet observed to abate their weight; if they produce visible and real effects by imponderous and invisible emissions, it may be unjust to deny the possible efficacy of gold, in the non-omission of weight, or deperdition of any ponderous particles.⁷⁸

That is how Sir Thomas Browne's text has stood since 1650. What he calls *effluvioms* in the paragraph preceding this sentence he here calls emissions and "emanations from their bodies." But in 1646, where he now has *emanations* Dr. Browne wrote *Aporrhoias*!⁷⁹ His

⁷⁷ II. W. 286–87. *Effluvium*, *effluxion*, and *emission* were practically interchangeable in the seventeenth century. It is true that the word *emission* was often reserved for the emission of light, and when in Platonic terms this was thought to be rays, *emission* carried a meaning alien to atomism. But when light was thought to be corpuscular, the emission was thought of as an effluxion. An example of how much the three words had in common is to be seen on fol. 585 of Thomas Stanley's *History of philosophy*, where the following phrases occur: "effluxions of Atoms," "such effluvioms," "such subtle emissions."

⁷⁸ II. W. 340.

⁷⁹ Cf. *Works*, ed. Geoffrey Keynes (London, 1928–1931), II, 311, n. 16.

discussion refers the *effluvi*ums of amulets to both the continuous emission of amber and the particulate effluxion from lodestone, and his only commitment to one theory or the other in 1646 was the use of the atomistic word *aporrhōias*. The change in the second edition is in keeping with his habitual scientific caution. But in that one word *aporrhōias* Sir Thomas Browne, the modern, well-informed concerning Renaissance atomic theory and familiar with both its experimental foundation and its ancient heritage of ideas,⁸⁰ touches hands with Epicurus and his teachers, Democritus, Leucippus, and Empedocles.⁸¹

ROCKFORD COLLEGE

⁸⁰ Elsewhere I shall show Browne's practical and theoretical grasp of the physics of such contemporaries as Gassendi, Basso, Van Helmont, and Sennert, and his direct knowledge of the Epicurean remains in Diogenes Laertius and Lucretius. The present study is of the words only; the *thing* I have analyzed in Browne's own laboratory experiments, especially those on magnetism, and also in Browne's open allusions to atomists ancient and modern.

⁸¹ I have treated only the physical meanings of the words *effluvium*, *effluxion*, and *emission* as the more modern of the English natural philosophers used them in the seventeenth century. The words had spiritual meanings as well. Some of these derived metaphorically from ideas of physical flowing-off—"He as the Sovereign Magnet . . . Attracts every Living Stone by the Effluviums, the Flowings out of Life into, and upon it" (Thomas Beverely, *The praise of the glory of Grace* [London, 1701], p. 23). An earlier metaphor is the Platonic one of eyebeams:

"Our eye-beams twisted, and did thread
Our eyes upon one double string"

JOHN DONNE, "The ecstasy," ll. 7-8

From the old Greek view of sight and light arose Plotinus' principle of the divine emanation which, he said, is like the emanation of light—"Heav'n's fuller Effluence mocks our dazzl'd Sight," said Matthew Prior (*Poems* [1718], p. 311); and Jeremy Taylor: "I have described the effluxes of the Holy Spirit upon us in his great chanel." Other spiritual *effluvi*ums played a part in natural philosophy itself. These derived anciently from the firelike ether of Heraclitus; the Stoics called them the seminal *logoi* (λόγοι σπέρματικοί) and understood that they were part of the *anima mundi*. In medieval alchemy the *anima mundi* was half incarnated in the *spiritus mundi* and survived even in the seventeenth-century physiology as an invisible but active life-force. Gilbert called upon this Stoical *effluvium* when he described chemical combination as the result of the working of the *spiritus* or breath and when he spoke of the air as the universal *effluvium* of the world. The chemical *effluvium* was continuous and spiritous. Sir Thomas Browne described it in the following passage of *Pseudodoxia*: "That candles and lights burn dim and blue at the apparition of spirits may be true, if the ambient air be full of sulphureous spirits, as it happeneth oftentimes in mines, where damps and acid exhalations are able to extinguish them. And may be also verified, when spirits do make themselves visible by bodies of such effluviums" (III. W., 177-78). The electrical attraction of crystals, said Browne, "is made by a sulphureous effluvium" (II. W. 272). But the chemical *effluvium* here is definitely material, and a general examination of Browne's experiments and theories will show that already in 1646 he was inclined to find not only material *effluxions* but even corpuscular ones "very considerable" and perhaps able to act invisibly "through any medium"—"a part of philosophy but yet in discovery."

MISTRESS DELARIVIERE MANLEY'S BIOGRAPHY

PAUL BUNYAN ANDERSON

QUEEN ANNE'S redoubtable defender, the most vigorous, and most representative professional figure among English women who first tried to make a living by literature, has been left in the obscurity of her vaguely remembered scandalous reputation. Delariviere Manley was the second member of a female succession of professional writers, recognized as a group as early as 1732 by Eliza Haywood's panegyrist, Rev. James Sterling, who bid his auditors remember:

Pathetic *Behn*, or *Manley's* greater Name;
Forget their Sex, and own when *Haywood* writ,
She clos'd the fair Triumvirate of Wit.¹

The chances of scholarship have given Mrs. Behn and Mrs. Haywood scholarly attention, but have largely denied it to Mrs. Manley's "greater Name" as the eighteenth century conceived it.

Those who have written on Mistress Manley have either lacked the opportunity, or feared to take the risk, of making an intimate acquaintance with her. The author of a Swiss doctoral dissertation devoted to her life and her dramatic work disarms criticism by admitting that he did not have access to an adequate library.² Other commentators, better satisfied with their knowledge, have been guilty of curious conjectures, and careless statements. They have shown in general a dimness of perception insufficient to distinguish Mrs. Manley from Mrs. Haywood, or either of these ladies from some third female phantom.³

¹ G. F. Whicher, *The life and romances of Mrs. Eliza Haywood* (New York, 1915), p. 17.

² E. O. Zbinden, *Mrs. Mary Manleys Leben und dramatische Tätigkeit* (Basel, 1916), p. 84.

³ Mr. R. Brimley Johnson, in referring to Mrs. Manley and Mrs. Haywood, says, "both wrote novels of some vigour, but deservedly forgotten, although the latest, and best, of Mrs. Manley's were written after *Pamela*, and bear striking witness to the influence of Richardson" (*The women novelists* [London, 1918], p. 5). (He means Mrs. Haywood's; Mrs. Manley died in 1724.) A recent and presumably authoritative writer on Mrs. Manley, Mr. E. A. Baker, in the third volume of his *History of the English novel* (1929), reports [MODERN PHILOLOGY, February, 1936]

Miss Joyce M. Horner, using Sterling's phrase "The Fair Triumvirate of Wit" for the title of the first chapter of her *English women novelists and their connection with the Feminist movement (1688-1797)*, has had the distinction of being the first (1929-30) to treat the three women as a group, and to keep each woman distinctly in mind throughout a properly proportioned and sensible essay.⁴ Despite two separate undertakings to "do" Mrs. Manley in the manner of modern biography,⁵ the comparatively small body of biographical fact established by Mr. G. A. Aitken in his contributions to the *Dictionary of national biography* concerning Mrs. Manley and her father Sir Roger Manley has not been appreciably increased. Mrs. Manley's recent biographers have been more interested in exploiting her personality and her flaunting naughtiness than in a critical study of her writings and her career. No one has attempted to order and date the disconnected anecdotes which have passed for her biography, or to bring to bear information external to her autobiographical *Adventures of Rivella* in interpretation of its brightly colored, presumptuous pages. The most casual reader can discover open self-glorification in Mrs. Manley's autobiography, but he ought to find as well an exact picture of her mind in its naïve candor, its untrained ignorance, and its wistful eagerness to gain masculine approval. Without further evidence he may not be aware that her sophistication is not profound enough to make her capable of real deception. Beneath the alluring surface of her narrative lies a structure of objective fact.

that *The lost lover*, a comedy in verse, was successful (read: a comedy in prose was a failure), and mentions (with complete insensitivity to the anagram in *Almyra*, and to the play's genuine feminism and impressively normal and human qualities) *Almyra*, a fantastic play based on the *Arabian nights*. He lumps together without the slightest warrant *The secret history of Queen Zarah and the Zarazians* (1705), the four volumes of the *New Atalantis*, and the pirated *Court intrigues* (1711), and calls them the *New Atalantis*. He is unduly impressed by the commonplaces of Mrs. Manley's preface to *Queen Zarah*, and quotes from it twice (pp. 110 and 121), attributing the authorship the first time to Mrs. Manley and the second to Mrs. Haywood.

⁴ "Smith College studies in modern languages." Vol. XI, Nos. 1, 2, 3 (October, 1929; January, April, 1930). In a study of so wide a scope she could scarcely be expected to add much to our knowledge of Mrs. Manley.

⁵ Philip W. Sergeant, "Rivella the Reckless," *Rogues and scoundrels* (London, 1924), pp. 169-209; Walter and Clare Jerrold, "Mary de la Rivière Manley, alias 'Dela,'" *Five queer women* (London, New York, Paris, 1929), pp. 83-138, 350.

Professor William Henry Hudson included an appreciative appraisal of Mrs. Manley and Mrs. Behn—"Two novelists of the English Restoration"—in his *Idle hours in a library* (San Francisco, 1897), pp. 125-78. He recognized Mrs. Haywood's claims to consideration in a footnote on p. 142.

I

The foremost woman of letters of Queen Anne's England had a Cavalier heritage. Mistress Delariviere Manley sprang from the Manleys of Denbighshire who had gone forth to the civil war from the family home in the vicinity of Wrexham. Francis and Roger Manley, the two older sons of her grandfather, Cornelius Manley of Erbistock,⁶ fought for their king, and were knighted. John, the youngest son, it is true, strayed from the loyalist tradition of the Manleys, became a major in the parliamentary army, and married Margaret Dorislaus, daughter of the unfortunate Isaac Dorislaus, assassinated at The Hague by exiled Cavaliers for his share in the trial of Charles I.

Sir Roger Manley, Delariviere's father, chose a loyalist's career early, and continued it by a professional soldier's life, relieved and ornamented by a taste for learning and authorship.⁷ At sixteen he left the university to fight for Charles I. He was in the garrison of Denbigh which surrendered to Parliament in 1645,⁸ but he did not go into exile in Holland until "Rendition of Colchester"⁹ in August, 1648.¹⁰ He improved his years away from England by learning Dutch, and published after the Restoration *A true description of the mighty Kingdoms of Japan and Siam, written originally in Dutch by Francis Caron and Joost Schorten; and now rendred into English by Capt. Roger Manley* (London, 1663).¹¹ The only substantial reward Sir Roger received for his loyalty was modest military preferment.¹²

⁶ A. N. Palmer, *A history of the older Nonconformity of Wrexham and its neighbourhood* (Wrexham, n.d.), pp. 3 and 8, n. 9. Palmer gives references to various members of the Manley family in other works concerned with the history of Wrexham. Sir Richard Manley, controller of the household to Prince Henry, is designated by G. A. Aitken as the grandfather of Mrs. Manley.

⁷ Since G. A. Aitken, the contributor of the account of Mrs. Manley in the *Dictionary of national biography*, also secured much of the material used in the article on Sir Roger Manley (nominally by J. A. Cramb), Mr. Aitken has been the authority for the facts currently accepted about Mrs. Manley and her father.

⁸ J. H. Leslie, *The history of Landguard Fort, in Suffolk* (London, 1898), p. 100.

⁹ Mrs. Manley's preface to Vol. III of the *New Atlantis* (1720), III, ix.

¹⁰ S. R. Gardiner, *History of the great Civil War* (London, 1893), IV, 201. See also the account of the siege of Colchester recorded in Defoe's *Tour thro' the whole island of Great Britain* (London, 1927), I, 18-31.

¹¹ The dedication to his older brother Major Francis Manley asks pardon for mistakes in writing "our very Mother-Tongue" after a fourteen years' exile.

¹² Major John Henry Leslie gives a valuable documented list of the important dates in Sir Roger Manley's career (pp. 100-101). Some thirty letters written by Roger Manley are calendared in the reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission (as at present published)—none of them noticed by his previous biographers.

In June, 1665, he became an ensign in the Holland regiment, and, in September, a captain. From 1667 to November, 1672, he was lieutenant-governor, under Sir Thomas Morgan, and commander of all His Majesty's castles, forts, and forces within the island of Jersey. He left Jersey to become a captain in the royal regiment of Foot Guards, and to serve in various places in England, until he was sent with his company, in February, 1680, from Portsmouth to Landguard Fort, Suffolk, and appointed governor. At the accession of James II in February, 1685, Sir Roger Manley's commission as governor was renewed. He had then attained the rank of lieutenant colonel, and the command of a battalion of his regiment.

While Sir Roger was stationed in Jersey, he published *The history of the late warres in Denmark* (1670). At Landguard Fort he brought out his *Commentariorum de rebellione Anglicana* (1686),¹³ with a dedication to James II. Sir Roger Manley also supplied a continuation for *The Turkish history* of Richard Knolles and Sir Paul Rycout, covering the decade 1676-86.¹⁴ Delariviere herself declared that Sir Roger was the author of the first volume of the *Turkish spy*, giving her father a title, could it be substantiated, to considerable originality as an early exploiter of the oriental fiction, and of the device of the foreign observer which became so popular in eighteenth-century Europe.¹⁵

II

Delariviere Manley, the second of Sir Roger Manley's three daughters, probably made a precipitate entrance into the world in 1672 at the time the Manley family was leaving Jersey.¹⁶ According to the

¹³ This Latin history appeared, after Sir Roger's death, in an English translation (1691).

¹⁴ *The Turkish history* (2 vols.; London, 1687), II, 277-338.

¹⁵ For the controversy over the authorship of the *Turkish spy* see the *Gentleman's magazine*, XIV (1840), 260-63, 465-69; XV (1841), 265-70, and Henry Hallam, *Introduction to the literature of Europe in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth Centuries* (New York and Boston, 1863), IV, 316, n. 1. Cf. John Dunton's *Life and errors* (London, 1705), p. 242.

¹⁶ Mrs. Manley was born, according to the article in the *Dictionary of national biography*, in Jersey, or at sea between Jersey and Guernsey, April 7, 1663. This represents a revision of the information in the original edition of the *Dictionary*—a revision adopted in the *Errata* (1904) and credited to the Sloane MS 1708, fol. 117. The date originally given—"about 1672"—may be accepted with considerable probability. The information in the Sloane MS perhaps refers to the birth of Delariviere's older sister, Mary Elizabeth Manley. The date 1663 is impossible unless one can credit Mrs. Manley with more than the usual feminine capacity for deceit in the statement of her age. In January, 1712, Swift (*Journal to Stella*) found Mrs. Manley "about forty, very homely, and very fat."

tradition recorded by Edmund Curll in the preface to his edition of Mrs. Manley's autobiography, she was "born at Sea, between *Jersey* and *Guernsey* and christened by the Name of *De la Riviere Manley*"—certainly the name by which her contemporaries knew her, and the name which she invariably used in her letters, in her dedications, in her will, and on her tombstone.¹⁷ In christening his second daughter Delariviere, Sir Roger was paying a compliment to his superior officer, Sir Thomas Morgan, and to his wife, Delariviere Cholmondley Morgan.¹⁸

Sir Roger Manley was left a widower with three motherless daughters, Mary Elizabeth, Delariviere, and Cornelia, and a son, Francis. Sir Roger bred his son for a naval career, and reared his daughters under the care of a governess as best he could in the life of a garrison. Removing from Portsmouth, he established himself and his family, in February, 1680, at Landguard Fort, Suffolk.

Their father's military profession and literary tastes made it inevitable that the Manley girls should find their first social opportunities among young regimental officers—who were sometimes incipient men of letters as well as apprentice men of arms. Delariviere Manley, beginning her career of coquetry, as she asserts, at the age of twelve, wrote innumerable letters to John Tidcomb,¹⁹ "then a boy of sixteen on his father's estate not far from Landguard Fort," and carried on a platonic flirtation with him when he came to visit her and her sisters.

¹⁷ If she was called Mary Delariviere Manley by any authority other than G. A. Aitken's, she avoided the confusion likely to ensue from having two Marys in one family by using Delariviere consistently as her name.

¹⁸ John Burke and John Bernard Burke, *A genealogical and heraldic history of the extinct and dormant Baronetcies of England, Ireland, and Scotland* (2d ed.; London, 1841), p. 369. Sir John Morgan, Sir Thomas Morgan's son, named one of the granddaughters of Delariviere Cholmondley Morgan, Delariviere.

¹⁹ Under the pseudonym Sir Charles Lovemore, Mrs. Manley introduced Tidcomb as the narrator of the story of her life in *The adventures of Rivella*. The name Lovemore is perhaps borrowed from Steele's *Lying lover*—a play with which Mrs. Manley was familiar. In the *New Atlantis* (1720), IV, 304, she referred to Steele's second illegitimate child born from his "*Bright Cook-Maid*"—making a pointed allusion in this phrase to a striking scene in the *Lying lover* ("Mermaid series," *Richard Steele*, ed. G. A. Aitken [London and New York, n.d.], p. 159): "Ah! culinary fair, compose thy rage; thou whose more skilful hand is still employed in offices for the support of nature, descend not from thyself, thou bright cookmaid. . . ." It is possible that Tidcomb may have been the archetype for Steele's first sentimental hero. Mrs. Manley assigns Tidcomb a rôle as her constant but unrewarded lover. It is curious that Steele introduces two specific details, apparently without significance in the play, which apply to Tidcomb: Lovemore's name is given as John (*ibid.*, p. 177) and his father's residence (*ibid.*, p. 127) as Suffolk.

But the disturbances following the death of Charles II and the accession of his brother James II interrupted this precocious romance, bringing young Tidcomb a captain's commission, June 20, 1685, in the Earl of Huntingdon's regiment of foot,²⁰ and occasioning, much to the contentment of the Manley sisters, the sending of a new company of soldiers to the garrison. Mrs. Manley says that the detachment was not at Landguard Fort above eighteen days—but that was long enough for Mary Elizabeth, the oldest sister, to get herself married, and ample time for Delariviere to fall desperately in love. If Cornelia had not been too young to deserve notice, she too might have found a soldier-lover in the new company.

Mrs. Manley, telling the story in her best fictional manner in *The adventures of Rivella*, gave her own childhood infatuation the center of the stage, and so slighted her sister's romance as to leave it unsuspected by the reader. The whole affair, and the principal actors in it, emerge from the fictional disguise which has concealed them as soon as one examines the anecdote in the light of the *English army lists*, and of the history of a famous English regiment. Although Mrs. Manley says merely "upon the Report of an Invasion from *Holland*, a Supply of Forces was sent to the Garrison," the date of the visit of the new troops can be set precisely. In May and June, 1685, soon after James's accession, two expeditions sailed from Holland, one commanded by the Duke of Argyll and the other by the Duke of Monmouth. Under the pressure of events and of his own dark policies, James II had resolved to increase his regular army, and had raised between June and August twelve regiments of cavalry and nine of infantry. One of these regiments became the Twelfth, or Suffolk, Regiment. Among the officers first commissioned in 1685 were a Captain Francis Brathwaite and an Ensign James Carlisle.²¹ In April, 1688, the promotion of Ensign Carlisle to the lieutenancy of Francis Brathwaite's company is re-

²⁰ Charles Dalton, *English army lists and commission registers, 1661-1714* (London, 1892-1904), II, 34. Tidcomb was one of the gentlemen pensioners at the coronation of James II. On November 14, 1692, he was appointed colonel of a regiment of Foot (now the Fourteenth Foot). He was made a major general on April 7, 1705 (Narcissus Luttrell, *A brief historical relation of State affairs* [Oxford, 1857], V, 538). Tidcomb died in 1713 (Dalton, *English army lists* [1894], II, 34, n. 6), just a year too early to enjoy the notoriety given him in *The adventures of Rivella* (1714).

²¹ Dalton, II, 33.

corded.²² The first marching order of the Suffolk Regiment, dated July 11, 1685, directed that four companies were to remain at Yarmouth, and one was to proceed to Landguard Fort. On August 3, 1685, however, this company left Landguard Fort and rejoined headquarters.²³

Soon after the arrival of the new company, Rivella (Delariviere) became enamored of Lysander (Carlisle according to the key), a beautiful young "Subaltern Officer." Mary Elizabeth was "now upon her Marriage," and but four pages later in *The adventures of Rivella* it seems she is married, for when Delariviere writes of the family plans to deal with her own embarrassing partiality for the young ensign she says: "The Gentleman who had newly married her Sister, was of Counsel with the Family how to suppress this growing Misfortune. . . ." ²⁴ Sister Mary Elizabeth's husband, indeed, with the gloss of his new privileges still fresh upon him, "spoke roundly to the *Youth*, who had no Thoughts of improving the Opportunity, and charg'd him not to give in to the Follies of the young Girl; he told him he would shoot him thro' the Head if he attempted any thing towards soothing *Rivella's* Prepossession. . . ." Mrs. Manley, it must be said, does not give the slightest hint that Mary Elizabeth's husband was a captain in the company temporarily assigned to Landguard Fort, much less that she had met and married him under such unconventional circumstances. The evidence points to a brief acquaintance for Mary Elizabeth with Captain Brathwaite, and to her sudden marriage to him.²⁵ The precipitateness of the match may account for Delariviere's consistently adverse attitude toward it.²⁶

²² *Ibid.*, p. 157. The Prince and Princess of Orange landed in England in November. Francis Brathwaite, with three other captains, the colonel, the lieutenant colonel, and the major, adhered to James II at the revolution (see *ibid.*, pp. 142 n. and 33, n. 5).

²³ E. A. H. Webb, *History of the 12th (The Suffolk) Regiment 1685-1913* (London, 1914), pp. 3-4.

²⁴ *The adventures of Rivella* (1714), p. 20.

²⁵ She was still Mary Elizabeth Manley in 1684 when Peter Bellon dedicated to her his *Amours of Bonne Sforza, queen of Polonia* (1684). This fiction was offered in May, 1684 (*Term catalogues*, II, 70). A moderate capacity to attract dedications ran in this literary family. A few years later a work, amazing in its illiteracy and fanaticism, was dedicated to a member of the dissenting branch of the family—Major Manley: *England's faithful monitor: being the works of that suffering protestant, Mr. Stephen Huanance, when under exile and confinement, in the years 1685 and 1686* (London, 1689).

²⁶ See my discussion in *Modern philology*, XXVIII (1931), 359-60.

Lysander, passionately in love elsewhere, assured Rivella's new brother that he had no designs on her. Yet he came frequently to dinner at the Governor's hospitable table where Rivella saw him constantly and never removed her eyes from his face. Lysander (Captain James Carlisle, actor and playwright as well as soldier, and later the author of *The fortune hunters: or, Two fools well met* [1689]), with his versatile talents, had all the qualities calculated to win the youthful Mistress Manley's adoration: "His Voice was very good; the Songs then in Vogue amorous, and such as suited her Temper of Mind; she drank the Poyson both at her Ears and Eyes. . . ." ²⁷

The Governor was a wise man and pursued indirect methods. He asked Delariviere's sisters and the governess to divert her, but never to leave her alone with Lysander. In the meantime he sought to have the company recalled which had done so much to disturb his domestic peace. Mrs. Manley closes this episode in her family's history with a story she would wish her readers to admire as a pretty little anecdote in her sweetest and very best manner—the story of her replenishing her beloved Lysander's supply of guineas from her father's stock that Lysander might return to the gaming table with the other officers. ²⁸

To recover her composure, after the departure of the company and the loss of her ensign, Delariviere was sent to a "Hugenot Minister's House on the other Side of the Sea and Country about eighteen Miles farther from London," where her brother "was pension'd." In three months she learned to "speak and write French" ²⁹ with a Perfection truly wonderful," and had not "the Air . . . impair'd her Health" and necessitated her removal, the good minister would have engaged in twelve months "to make her Mistress of these Four Languages of which he was Master, viz. Latin, French, Spanish and Italian." ³⁰ Aside from the casual benefits she must have received in the household of a military father with a taste for learning, the only bit of education on

²⁷ *The adventures of Rivella* (1714), p. 20.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 21-22.

²⁹ She read her Plutarch in Amyot's French. Mrs. Manley consoled herself in the preface to *The lost lover* (1696) for the failure of her comedy by saying "with a Grecian Hero, I had been lost, if I had not been lost." In Letter I of *The lady's packet broke open* (1707) she remarked, "He might well say with Themistocles, that he had been lost if he had not been lost." This is her English form of a quotation from Plutarch's life of Themistocles: a literal translation of Amyot's French (*nous étions perdus*). The English translations accessible to her agree in rendering this turn on words with undone.

³⁰ *The adventures of Rivella* (1714), p. 27.

record for Delariviere is her brief stay with the Huguenot minister. She had high hopes, however, of attending the most distinguished, and, indeed, almost the only higher school for women of her time—the court. Delariviere “had the promise of the next Vacancy for Maid of Honour to the Queen.” But Mary of Modena’s flight to France in December, 1688, and the succeeding “glorious revolution” destroyed Delariviere’s hopes and darkened her whole world. Her family was uncompromising in adhering to its traditional loyalty to the Stuart line. The misfortunes of his royal master sank so deeply into Sir Roger’s heart, his daughter says (with truth to feeling if not to chronology), that he died soon after the revolution.²¹

Delariviere and Cornelia, the two younger girls, were left to the care of John Manley, a son of the Cromwellian Major John Manley, but a young man who had been educated by his uncle Sir Roger, and treated with affection and understanding for many years as if he had been Sir Roger’s son. He repaid the trust that had been placed in him by deceiving Delariviere with a mock marriage, and getting her with child. She and her son²² lived in miserable seclusion in London for three years, until a new business opportunity obliged John Manley to go into the country, where his first wife was living. Nothing less than notable dishonor and the necessity of earning her bread was likely in this early period to induce a woman of respectable family to take to Grub Street.

III

The woman of letters was not yet differentiated as a distinct kind of person with special functions and privileges apart from the common lot of female kind. Delariviere Manley, the most vigorous and most representative creature of her species, had to follow an extraordinary variety of occupations, turning her woman’s talents to any pursuit which promised her profit, diversion, or publicity. In 1693–94 she was launched on her public career as a female retainer to the aging Duchess of Cleveland, who fancied that Mrs. Manley brought her luck at

²¹ J. H. Leslie showed that Sir Roger Manley’s successor at Landguard Fort was appointed March 19, 1687. Quoting the *Military entry book*, Major Leslie placed Sir Roger’s death early in March, 1687. His will was dated February 26, 1686, but it was not proved until June 11, 1688.

²² We hear no more of him except for the references in *The adventures of Rivella* (1714), pp. 85, 86.

cards. In the Duchess' household and at Mme de Mazarin's gaming salon, Delariviere Manley saw the old Restoration world in its ripest decay. Dismissed by the Duchess of Cleveland,³³ she retired to the west of England to live more cheaply, and to muster her resources for a fresh sally into London. She improved her time in the country, for in 1696 she courted the favor of the town with her *Letters*, written on the stage-coach journey to Exeter, and (under the patronage of the Duke of Devonshire and Sir Thomas Skipwith) with a comedy, *The lost lover*, at Drury Lane, and a tragedy, *The royal mischief*, at Lincoln's Inn Fields.

Meeting with but moderate success in her first literary ventures, she turned for some years to more conventional ways for a woman to get a living. She became the mistress of John Tilly,³⁴ unscrupulous lawyer, and deputy warden of the Fleet prison, and shared his projects³⁵ until December, 1702, when she gave him up that he might marry a rich widow, Mrs. Margaret Smith, daughter of Sir John Reresby.³⁶

³³ Mrs. Manley's place in the affections of the Duchess of Cleveland was taken by a female dependent, enticed away from the Duchess of Mazarin—a "pretended Madam Beauclair," whose ultimate, though concealed, origin was English. In "a few months" this woman contrived a marriage between the Duchess of Cleveland's eldest son (upon whom his mother had accused Mrs. Manley of having designs) and a girl of little or no fortune. The Duke of Southampton did marry Anne, daughter of Sir William Pulteney, in November, 1694. Cf. P. W. Sergeant, *My Lady Castelmaine* (London, 1912), p. 277.

³⁴ She was asked by her friend Catherine Trotter to save Tilly from the consequences of a parliamentary investigation by interceding with the worthy John Manley, who had been appointed chairman of the committee looking into Tilly's administration of the Fleet prison. Cf. with Mrs. Manley's account in *The adventures of Rivella the Journals of the House of Commons*, XI (December 30, 1696), pp. 641-44. Her realistic soul found satisfaction in Tilly's capacity for "business," and the unscrupulous management of his affairs. She fancied that she could make him share her romantic aspirations and her intellectual interests. Finding him a miracle of taste and learning, considering his obvious lack of early advantages and his unfortunate early marriage, she made him respond to her tuition both in intellectual matters and in the art of love. She stimulated his mind with La Rochefoucauld, and with her everyday applications of the selfishness psychology. She opened new worlds of experience to Tilly, and was half indignant that his wife should not be sympathetic, and appreciative of her disinterested effort to cultivate a thwarted spirit.

³⁵ Neglecting any mention of some sort of a dubious connection with an alchemist, and the normal preoccupation with various kinds of personal accommodations which the management of the Fleet permitted, one must note that Mrs. Manley and Tilly (with some unreliable support from John Manley) maintained a fantastic hope for riches through the vicissitudes of some four or five years of intriguing in connection with the dispute between Ralph Montagu and the Earl of Bath over the disposition of the estate of the Duke of Albemarle. This affair takes up a disproportionate amount of space in *The adventures of Rivella*. Notwithstanding Mrs. Manley's boasted legal knowledge, and her feminine gifts for the manipulation of men, when Christopher Monck came to his wretched end, July 4, 1701, she and Tilly found themselves considerably out of pocket. For the whole course of the litigation see E. F. Ward, *Christopher Monck, Duke of Albemarle* (London, 1915), pp. 339-53; and the references in Luttrell, and in *The Portledge papers*, ed. Russel J. Kerr, and Ida Coffin Duncan (London, 1928).

³⁶ On the death of Tilly's first wife Mrs. Manley continued to show her disinterested spirit. Her lover's straitened circumstances and the loss of a lawsuit led him (with her

While living with Tilly, Mrs. Manley made young Richard Steele's acquaintance, carried on an affectionate correspondence with him when he was in the Isle of Wight, and became his friend and adviser.³⁷ She directed him in his need to her own midwife—Mrs. Phipps at the sign of the Coffin and Cradle—helped him to escape the malice of his creditors, and prevented his ruin by an alchemist. Following Tilly's marriage, she went to Bristol, the lesser metropolis of eighteenth-century England, to reduce expenses, and to recover her spirits. In the spring of 1704 she was in London again. That summer she visited a feminist friend, Sarah Fyge Egerton,³⁸ in Buckinghamshire, quarreled with the country poetess, and, as a result, lost a suit in Doctor's Commons which Mrs. Manley had expected to yield a £100 a year for

consent) to court the rich widow of George Smith. Her brother William, the eldest son of Sir John Resesby, "is said to have ended a spendthrift career, baronet, though he was, as a tapster in Fleet Prison" (J. S. Fletcher, *Yorkshiremen of the Restoration* (London, 1921), p. 127). The issuing of Tilly's license to wed his widow is recorded in Joseph Foster, *London marriage licenses, 1521-1869* (London, 1887), p. 1343. Mrs. Manley told the story of her sacrifice twice: in Letter XXXIII of the *Lady's packet broke open* (1707) and in *The adventures of Rivella* (1714), pp. 104-6.

³⁷ Two series of letters in the much-neglected *Lady's packet broke open* are either the actual texts of Steele's correspondence with Mrs. Manley or fictionalized adaptations of an actual correspondence: Letters XII-XXIV and XXXIV-XXXVII. She knew Steele intimately in his early period of struggle after he left the university. The first "Steele" series is written with affectionate intimacy and gallantry by a young soldier and poet, somewhat uncertain as to his future, to a woman whom he admires for her wit, her poetry, and her interest in alchemy. Their friendship is a "platonic" one, grounded on a union of minds and of interests, for he implies that he has joined her in employing an alchemical operator, and keeps nothing back about his pursuit of an attractive girl. He indicates that he is living on an island, and that he cannot come to town (Letter XIX) because his "Colonel, the Governor here, is expected daily, and I stay to attend him in his Diversions and Retirement; in which we shall have many pleasing Entertainments. . . ." (For the tastes and policy of Lord Cutts cf. *Letters of John, Lord Cutts to Colonel Joseph Dudley* [Cambridge, 1886], p. 18.) He continues the story of his difficulties in the second series of letters, and opens his heart to his witty and worldly feminine friend about a serious and pious literary project (*The Christian hero* [?], dedication signed "Tower-Guard, March 23, 1701"), but he is saddened by the thought that she will probably not share the pleasure that he has now discovered in "downright Religion." He had been keeping up some kind of communication with the town, as he shows in his reference (in the first series) to receiving letters that had been left for him with his aunt (Lady Mildmay?), but he had vexations to remove before he could be at rest: ". . . Mrs. P—s (now my greatest Terror) has prevented my venturing to you." Mrs. Manley's claim that she protected Steele from "the implacable Midwife," and her story of rescuing him from the alchemist, are given in the *New Atalantis* (1720), I, 205-12; IV, 306. Mrs. Phipps's actual bill, found among Steele's papers, is printed in G. A. Aitken, *Life of Richard Steele* (London, 1889), I, 83-84.

³⁸ She was the second wife of Thomas Egerton, the rector of Adstock, Buckinghamshire. This clergyman had hoped in marrying Sarah, Mrs. Manley says, to get help in writing his sermons, but he had found her a "new" woman, with troublesome ambitions to be a wit. She loved to read plays, and to write and publish poetry. She was just religious enough to quote Paul, to gibe at the deists, and to retail petty scandal. There are a few facts recorded about her in the *Records of Buckinghamshire*, VIII (1903), 34. Letters V-LX of *The lady's packet broke open* represent her correspondence with Mrs. Manley. Mrs. Egerton is handled rather roughly in the *New Atalantis* (1720), III, 259; I, 171-78.

life.³⁹ Though fortune, as she complained, never turned her prospects to good, it was always ready to supply a new and different opportunity to tempt her optimistic soul.

The earlier part of her career prepared her for the fuller glory which was to come in the last years of the reign of Queen Anne. Mrs. Manley first attempted her peculiar blend of amorous satirical fiction and politics during the parliamentary elections of 1705, when she published as campaign literature her preliminary essay for the *New Atalantis*—the two parts of the *Secret history of Queen Zarah and the Zarazians*—lampoons directed against Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, and the Whigs.⁴⁰

In December, 1706, Mrs. Manley's best tragedy, derived from the recently published English translation of the *Arabian nights*, and delicately adumbrating her personal and feminist aspirations, appeared on the stage of Vanbrugh's new theater in the Haymarket. With her customary modesty she christened the play and its heroine *Almyna*—using an anagram of her own name.

The year 1707 was full of difficulties for Mrs. Manley. To turn an honest penny (which she laments she never received), Mrs. Manley executed two commissions (probably from her indolent friend, Mary Pix) for funeral elegies for Edward and Cary Coke of the great Coke family of Norfolk.⁴¹ In May, 1707, tired of waiting for another performance of *Almyna*, Mrs. Manley printed the play and dispatched it to her patroness the Countess of Sandwich, asking her for pecuniary aid—an "execution" having seized all of Mrs. Manley's goods.⁴² Per-

³⁹ The case is summarized by John Nichols, *The epistolary correspondence of Sir Richard Steele* (2 vols., 1787), II, 456-57. He did not know that Mrs. Manley had referred to the matter in any of her writings; see, in addition to the passages on Mrs. Egerton in the *New Atalantis*, the story of Mrs. Manley's friend, Mary Thompson, in Letter XXXII of *The lady's packet broke open*.

⁴⁰ The first part of *Queen Zarah* perhaps appeared during the elections; the second part in November, 1705 (*Term catalogues*, III, 481).

⁴¹ For some reason Mrs. Manley excised the elegies and the explanatory material (I [1709], 89-106) from the first collected edition of the *New Atalantis* in 1720. The satirical and realistic treatment of Cary and Edward Coke survives alone, without the contrasting prelude of the formal memorial elegies, in the editions of the *New Atalantis* commonly consulted. Edward Coke died April 13, 1707; Cary Coke, August 1, 1707. Though he showed no knowledge of the always obscure Mrs. Manley, who had written elegies for his subjects, and shaped their tragic story into an English *Princesse de Clèves*, Mr. Charles Warburton James devoted an interesting chapter in his *Chief Justice Coke, his family & descendants at Holkham* (1930) to the unfortunate Cary and Edward Coke.

⁴² *Hist. MSS Com.: report on the manuscripts of the Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry* (London, 1899), I, 357. The editors have supplied a date for Mrs. Manley's letter (ca. 1710), and the name of the Duke of Montagu as the person to whom it was addressed.

haps as another shift to ward off misfortune she got together *The lady's packet broke open*,⁴³ and disposed of this collection of letters to B. Bragge, who, in 1709, became the first printer of the *Female tattle*.

IV

The period of Mrs. Manley's greatest literary activity, beginning slightly before the full triumph of the Tories, coincided roughly with their years of power, 1710-14. Never forgetting that she was a Cavalier's daughter, she quickly offered her pen to her party. Her vogue began in May, 1709 with the publication of the first volume of the *Secret memoirs and manners of several persons of quality of both sexes, from the New Atalantis, an island in the Mediterranean*. Her society "novel" with a political shading scored an immediate, if notorious, success. Everyone, from Pope and Swift, and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, down to the veriest country bumpkin visiting in London, read the *New Atalantis*. Turning to journalism, Mrs. Manley began the *Female tattle* on July 8, 1709, and in Mrs. Crackenthorpe, "a Lady that knows every thing," created an impudent, larger-than-life version of herself, in whose person she could ridicule with safety the daily affairs of anyone in England who stepped into the circle of her omniscience.⁴⁴ On July 19 she brought out a second edition of the first volume of the *New Atalantis*.⁴⁵ Meanwhile she was preparing the second

⁴³ This is the running title, and the most convenient title, for the strange assortment of correspondence and fiction, which was divided into two parts, and printed as appendixes to translations from Mme d'Aulnoy. Letters I-XXIV, as the *History of the works of the learned testifies*, appeared as a supplement to a translation of Mme d'Aulnoy's *Memoirs of the court of England* (January, 1707). The remainder of *The lady's packet broke open*, Letters XXV-XL, was issued in November, 1707 (*Term catalogues*, III, 570), with Mme d'Aulnoy's *Memoirs of the Earl of Warwick*. Both of these volumes were issued in second editions in 1708 with descriptive captions added at the head of each letter in *The lady's packet broke open*. This contribution of Mrs. Manley to the letter-fiction has been almost entirely neglected, perhaps because it has been regarded, in the only form in which it has been known, *Court intrigues, in a collection of original letters, from the island of the New Atalantis &c.* (1711), as an inferior continuation of the *New Atalantis*. Mrs. Manley herself took pains in the *Examiner* on June 14, 1711 to denounce the *Court intrigues* as a pirated edition of a book "twice printed before, under the Title of The Lady's Packet broke Open." *The second volume of familiar letters* (London, 1718, and 1724), edited by Sam. Briscoe, offered Letters I, II, X, XXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX, and XL of *The lady's packet broke open*. In the 1718 edition the engraving of the lady (facing p. 88) is identified by these words printed beneath it: "Beau Wilson's Mistress."

⁴⁴ Anderson, pp. 354-60; cf. R. T. Milford's comment, *Modern philology*, XXIX (1932), pp. 350-51. My forthcoming article, "Splendor out of scandal: the Lucinda-Artesia papers in *The female tattle*," will present the evidence for Dr. Bernard Mandeville's collaboration in the periodical for five months and his authorship of thirty-two issues.

⁴⁵ *Tattle*, No. 43.

volume and published it on October 20, 1709.⁴⁶ Although Lady Mary Wortley Montagu had placed her order for the second volume of the *New Atalantis*, to be dispatched to her by a friend in town as soon as it should be issued, the Whig government acted so quickly in suppressing the book that not all of Lady Mary's imperious displeasure could bring her a copy.⁴⁷

When the author, the printer, and the publishers of the *New Atalantis* were taken into custody on October 29, 1709,⁴⁸ both the "Atalantic lady" and omniscient Mrs. Crackenthorpe necessarily suspended their activities. Mrs. Manley's own pert narrative gives the only account of her examination. Her interrogators were particularly concerned to discover her sources of information. Replying "with much Humility and Sorrow" for having offended, she denied that she had any design in writing but her own amusement, and protested that she had not intended any reflections upon particular persons.

When this was not believ'd, and the contrary urg'd very home to her by several Circumstances and Likenesses; she said then it must be *Inspiration*, because knowing her own Innocence she could account for it no other Way: The Secretary reply'd upon her, that *Inspiration* us'd to be upon a good Account, and her Writings were stark naught; she told him, with an Air full of Penitence, that might be true, but it was as true, that there were evil Angels as well as good; so that nevertheless what she had wrote might still be by *Inspiration*.⁴⁹

On November 5, 1709, she was admitted to bail.⁵⁰ She was discharged, after several continuations of the case, on February 13, 1710.⁵¹

Lest she be thought discouraged or repentant, she brought out as soon as possible a third volume of the *New Atalantis*, which she called *Memoirs of Europe, towards the close of the eighth century, written by Eginardus, secretary and favourite to Charlemagne; and done into English by the translator of the New Atalantis*. On May 12, 1710, Mrs. Manley sent Harley a copy of the *Memoirs of Europe*, and a letter in

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, No. 83.

⁴⁷ W. Moy Thomas, *The letters and works of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu* (London, 1893), I, 145-47.

⁴⁸ Luttrell, VI, 505.

⁴⁹ *The adventures of Rivella* (1714), p. 113.

⁵⁰ Luttrell, VI, 508.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 546.

which she volunteered (with prudent forethought) to explain her gilded fictional "representations," should he find them obscure.⁵² She humbly offered her services to the Tory prime minister. The second edition of the *Memoirs of Europe* was advertised in the *Examiner* on September 21, 1710; and a second volume of the work was said to be in press. Its publication was announced in the *Examiner* on November 23, 1710. This completed the *Memoirs of Europe* and added a fourth and last volume to the *New Atalantis*.

Winning Swift's amused but real respect for her talents, Mrs. Manley became his understrapper in writing slyly effective Tory political pamphlets in which she turned to account the skill in plausible insinuation, acquired in years of practice in fabricating prose fiction. Succeeding Swift, she served for a time as editor of the Tory political organ, the *Examiner*, and, in spite of her respect for her greater dignity in her new rôle, came perilously near to resurrecting Mrs. Crackenthorpe in the person of the "Examiner." Her *Examiners* were incipient *Female tattlers*. Proposing a new project in August, 1714, just after Harley's resignation and the death of the Queen, Mrs. Manley wrote to the rejected Tory minister,⁵³ offering to compose a political fiction, describing the recent changes in the government, and using as a "commodious scene" Dampier's description of the Queen of Achin's court and her country.⁵⁴ The death of Queen Anne and the fall of the ministry, she would have Harley believe, left her deprived of hope, and so destitute of resources⁵⁵ that the fearful Mrs. Manley, defender of the late Queen and her ministers, must lurk in the country for want of proper mourning garments to make an appearance in London.⁵⁶ In

⁵² *Hist. MSS Com.: the manuscripts of his grace the Duke of Portland* (London, 1897), IV, 541.

⁵³ *Hist. MSS Com.: report on the manuscripts of his grace the Duke of Portland* (Norwich, 1899), V, 491.

⁵⁴ Captain William Dampier, *Voyages and descriptions* (3d ed.; London, 1705), II, 120-49.

⁵⁵ She acknowledged receiving £50 from Harley on June 14, 1714 (*Hist. MSS Com.: report on the manuscripts of his grace the Duke of Portland* [Norwich, 1899], V, 458). This is the only known direct payment to Mrs. Manley for her political services. Swift was indignant at receiving the same sum from Harley (*Journal to Stella*, February 7 and March 7, 1710/11). Mrs. Manley was also granted an advance of £20 from Benjamin Tooke on her claim on the future profits of the patent as king's printer—see her will, *Notes and queries*, VIII (7th ser., 1889), 156; and also John Nichols, *Literary anecdotes of the eighteenth century* (London, 1812-15), I, 72-74.

⁵⁶ *Hist. MSS Com.: report on the manuscripts of . . . the Duke of Portland*, V, 491.

the previous March, forestalling Curll's hack, Charles Gildon,⁵⁷ she had written her autobiography, *The adventures of Rivella*, chiefly in a mood of triumphant self-glorification, but with an occasional thought for the morrow, when the Tories would be out of favor, and she would realize in its awful fulness "the Folly of a Woman's disobliging any one Party, by a Pen equally qualified to divert all."

Her later publications—another tragedy, *Lucius, the first Christian King of Britain* (1717), and *The power of love: in seven novels* (1720), a modernization of Renaissance stories mainly from Painter's *Palace of pleasure*—were intended merely for the entertainment of her public without any secondary intention of political edification.⁵⁸ In 1724, the year of her death,⁵⁹ Curll tried to persuade Walpole that she was practicing her old trade with something like her pristine vigor, and that she was preparing to publish (with the help of Bevil Higgons) a fifth volume of the *New Atalantis*.⁶⁰ Whatever may have been her intention, nothing came of it.

V

Her life was unified by the vigor of the conception which she held of herself and impressed upon her contemporaries. She made the readers of her autobiography see that the cultivated, passionate, generous,

⁵⁷ See Curll's preface to the posthumous edition of Mrs. Manley's autobiography (1725), or Ralph Straus, *The unspeakable Curll* (London, 1927), pp. 44–47.

⁵⁸ The first collected edition of the *New Atalantis* was published in 1720. Prior sent her Vertue's engraving of his portrait by Richardson (*Hist. MSS Com.: calendar of the manuscripts of the Marquis of Bath* [Hereford, 1908], III, 479). John Hervey wrote to her in admiring and affectionate terms (*Letter-books of John Hervey, first Earl of Bristol* [Wells, 1894], Letters 507, 529, 583). He gave her twenty guineas (*Diary* [Wells, 1894], p. 115) for her poetic tribute to his wife (printed from a manuscript copy, *ibid.*, pp. 195–99). This poem was published in *A new miscellany of original poems* (1720), pp. 201–7, in Theophilus Cibber's *The lives of the poets of Great Britain and Ireland* (1753), IV, 19–22; and in John Nichols, *A select collection of poems* (1780–82), VII, 369–75. J. Moore, Esq., of Worcester college, Oxford (later to be James Moore Smythe of Grub Street), exchanged complimentary verses with Mrs. Manley (*A new miscellany of original poems* [1720], pp. 191–96). Bevil Higgons published a tribute to her, said to have been written in a blank leaf of *The royal mischief: A new miscellany* (1720), p. 228. Even Mrs. Manley's widowed younger sister, Cornella Markendale, shared some of the honors of Grub Street fame, and the distinction of a tribute in a miscellany. Letter VIII, "On Blindness," in a collection which should be attributed to Charles Gildon—*Miscellanea aurea: or the Golden medley* (1720)—is addressed to Mrs. M—dale on Lambeth-Hill.

⁵⁹ *The Weekly journal*, February 29, 1724, reported her "dangerously ill." On March 2 Curll wrote to Walpole disclosing her supposed dangerous plans. "The chronological diary" (p. 35) of *The historical register*, Vol. IX (1724), gave an obituary notice, placing her death on July 11, 1724. For the details of her death, and the inscription on her tombstone, see *An impartial history of the life, character, amours, travels, and transactions of Mr. John Barber . . .* (1741), pp. 45–46.

⁶⁰ *Gentleman's magazine*, I (1798), 190 f.

Cavalier gentlewoman had met the strange demands of her difficult life with resolute cleverness and good humor. To the cool observer like Swift, her daily life seemed in part a pretentious pose, and in part a realistic acceptance of the necessity of making her way in a world very different from that into which she had been born. In her own warm fancy, her career and her character (considering the difficulties of the new age) appeared splendidly consistent. She pretended, as she finished *The adventures of Rivella*, that she found her autobiography less commensurate than her life with the imaginative pattern she had before her eyes. Two years earlier, in the *Journal to Stella*, Swift had drawn a realistic portrait of his female understrapper in her true condition as mistress⁶¹ to the illiterate and parsimonious Tory printer (later Lord Mayor), John Barber:⁶²

Poor Mrs. Manley, the author, is very ill of a dropsy and sore leg; the printer tells me he is afraid she cannot live long. I am heartily sorry for her; she has very generous principles for one of her sort; and a great deal of good sense and invention: she is about forty, very homely, and very fat.⁶³

In *The adventures of Rivella* her spokesman, Sir Charles Lovemore, apologizes for his inadequacy as her biographer, and, in concluding, paints to order a portrait of Mrs. Manley as she cherished the fantastic vision of her possible self in her heart of hearts. The daughter of Sir Roger Manley, loyal servant to his king, had flourished in Grub Street, but in her unfavorable environment she had not forgotten that she was a Cavalier's daughter: a mistress of the graces of social life, and of brilliant, easy conversation. She had cherished wit as an ideal, and as a heritage from the Restoration. She had read the best authors. She had culture. She knew how to live.

. . . I should have brought you to her Table well furnish'd and well serv'd; have shown you her sparkling Wit and easy Gaiety, when at Meat with Persons of Conversation and Humour: From thence carried you (in the Heat of Summer after Dinner) within the Nymphs Alcove, to a Bed nicely sheeted and strow'd with *Roses*, *Jessamins* or *Orange-Flowers*, suited to the variety of the Season; her Pillows neatly trim'd with Lace or Muslin, stuck

⁶¹ She lived in town to be near Barber and his printing press only in the winter. She spent her summers at Beckley, Oxfordshire. Note James Moore Smythe's facetious letter, *Mr. Pope's literary correspondence* (London, 1735-37), III, 9-10.

⁶² There is a rival life of John Barber—which is on the whole superior to the one named above—*The life and character of John Barber, Esq.* (London, 1741).

⁶³ *Journal to Stella*, January 28, 1711/12.

round with *Junquils*, or other natural Garden Sweets, for she uses no Perfumes, and there have given you leave to fancy your self the happy Man, with whom she chose to repose her self, during the Heat of the Day, in a State of Sweetness and Tranquility: From thence conducted you towards the cool of the Evening, either upon the *Water*, or to the *Park for Air*, with a Conversation always new, and which never cloyes . . . the only Person of her Sex that knows how to *Live*, and of whom we may say, in relation to Love, since she has so peculiar a Genius for, and has made such noble Discoveries in that Passion, that it would have been a *Fault in her, not to have been Faulty*.⁶⁴

In intending to present a roguish apology for herself, she has given us her very image. Her impudence accepted no truce with the ironic actualities of her life.

PAUL BUNYAN ANDERSON

PARSONS COLLEGE

⁶⁴ *The adventures of Rivella* (1714), pp. 119-20.

WILLIAM PITTIS AND QUEEN ANNE JOURNALISM

THEODORE F. M. NEWTON

II

WITH the discovery that two Tory journals of the first five years of the eighteenth century, *Heraclitus ridens* (1703-4) and the *Whipping post* (1705), were written by a former Fellow of Oxford named William Pittis, a new personality challenges the attention of students of Queen Anne journalism. From the highways and byways of the records and gossip of the time, materials may be gleaned for a sketch of surprising proportions—a sketch which brings to light the editor of at least three important, if short-lived, periodicals of the age; the certain author of over fifty occasional pieces; and the probable author of many more. One makes the acquaintance of a youth whose verses Dryden praised, of a friend of the libertine Ned Ward, of a companion of that literary *bon viveur*, Tom Brown. One discovers a commentator whose path crossed and recrossed that of Daniel Defoe so often that the resulting imprints offer valuable new information about the author of the *Review*. The life-history revealed fits no conventional “success story” framework, however; it is the story, rather, of a clever, dissipated rake who traveled the downhill road from early prominence as a writer to later insignificance. In fact, almost the last one hears of him is that he has become one of the more able, if less flourishing, craftsmen of that invidious school of scribblers who wrote for the “unspeakable” Curll.

Although many libraries contain a number of works by Pittis, few library catalogues list more than one or two under his name, for the vast majority of his writings appeared anonymously. The handlist to the Trent collection in the Boston Public Library carries Pittis entries for ten different works. A series of notes in manuscript form in the Bodleian Library, made by Rawlinson for a new edition of Wood, accredit William Pittis with not more than nineteen specific publications. The reference in the *Dictionary of national biography* is a short and inaccurate paragraph following the account of Dr. Thomas Pittis’

life.¹ No list of works includes the periodicals with which he was certainly concerned, and few mention many of the other works which, as will be shown, are either solely or primarily the product of Pittis' pen.

Steering his troubled way between tavern doors, debtors' prisons, and the scribbler's pillory, Pittis eminently upholds the uncomfortable tradition concerning the personal character of ministers' sons. He was pre-eminently a "son of the cloth," for his father, brother, and brother-in-law were all Anglican divines. It was little wonder that even in his most abject moments Pittis never wavered from his Royalist and High Church sympathies, for his father, Dr. Thomas Pittis, was chaplain and lecturer to the King even before the birth of William, his second son, in 1674. Both William and his brother Thomas, five years his senior, were probably born at the rectory of Christ Church, Newgate, although in their early youth Dr. Pittis was transferred to St. Botolph's, Aldgate. One of their two sisters, Elizabeth, married Zacheus Isham, who became almost as famous for his sermons and religious publications as his noted father-in-law and, curiously enough, succeeded him as rector of St. Botolph's.

In 1687, the year of his father's death, Pittis, at the age of thirteen entered Winchester, and three years later matriculated at New College, Oxford. He soon became a Fellow of this college, a distinction of which he was always proud, although, according to Oldmixon, he succumbed to a vice not uncommon at eighteenth-century Oxford and "sold his fellowship."² Yet this pride in the dignity of the title he had achieved is shown by the signature on a number of his works: "W. Pittis, Late Fellow of New College, Oxford."

While still at Oxford, he disclosed a literary flair and a sound knowledge of the classics. Probably as early as the summer of his sophomore year, he commenced contributing to Motteux's new and fashionable *Gentleman's journal*. The issue of that miscellany for July, 1692, contains an imitation of the twelfth ode of the fourth book of Horace by "W. P.," and the issue for March, 1693, prints the imita-

¹ The *DNB* makes the curious statement that William Pittis was pilloried "for writing a Memorial of the Church of England which had been published in 1704 and which James Drake Poley [sic] the member from Ipswich and others, were accused of having a hand in." Pittis was pilloried for writing *The case of the Church of England's memorial fairly stated*, a pamphlet supporting *The memorial of the Church of England*. The latter, written chiefly by Dr. James Drake, was published in 1705.

² *The history of England* . . . (1735), III, 510.

tion of the twenty-first ode of Horace's third book by "W. Pettis" which was to appear twelve years later in the 1705 *Whipping post* in those dark days when the absconding Whipster, barred from discussing political topics, was badly in need of "filler" for his sheet. Throughout the year 1693, Pittis' contributions to the *Journal* appear side by side with those of such literary lights as Congreve, Dennis, Prior, Sedley, Tate and others. He latinized five lines from Dryden's *Don Sebastian* on "Wine";³ he wrote an English paraphrase for an epigram "made over a glass."⁴ In the first number of the following year, he presented the translation of an excerpt from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*; and in May offered a selection from the *Aeneid*, which was to appear in almost identical form in the second issue of the poetry periodical, *Miscellanies over claret*, three years later.

Motteux seems to have cherished a high opinion of his Oxford contributor, for when he published his translation of Rabelais in 1693, one of the five prefatory poems was signed "William Pittis, Fellow of New Colledge in Oxon, Oct. the 2d, 1693." Any meed of praise for these verses must go to intention rather than execution, yet the editor of the *Gentleman's journal* considered the verses "To the excellent translator of Rabelais" good enough to stand second of the five poems and next to that of the poet laureate, Nahum Tate. It was no small honor for a nineteen-year-old youth, still an Oxford undergraduate. Possibly such lines as

Thou mak'st our rugged Tongue to Rules submit
Dissolving inharmonious Words to wit,
So just and smooth each burly word is spun
Rabelais would own his nicest Touch out-done

appealed all too successfully to Huguenot vanity.

Leaving behind him at Oxford a record for intemperance which was to pale into insignificance beside that of the following years, Pittis came up to London, probably in 1695, and established himself in the Inner Temple. He seems to have taken up the study of medicine and industriously aspired to be one of the wits of the town. The first separate publication known to bear his name is *An epistolatory poem to N. Tate, Esquire: and Poet Laureat to His Majesty: occasioned by the*

³ *Gentleman's journal*, April, 1693.

⁴ *Ibid.*, June, 1693.

taking of Namur (1696). Modesty and reserve at no time seem to have been leavening graces in Pittis' nature, and early evidences of this appear in the poem. One year out of Oxford, he criticizes the poetry of the great Congreve who, he says, has a better reputation "in Pastoral" than as a "Pindarick Writer." In discussing the dramatist's *Ode to the King on the reduction of Namur*, he states that Addison and Yalden are the only poets who have dared "a noble song" on the taking of Namur. In the following year he changed his stand somewhat, and accused Congreve of lifting part of Congreve's *Namur* ode to make his own.⁵

During the period when this poem was composed, Pittis apparently studied under the famous surgeon Tyson. He concludes the preface to his poem to Tate by saying that he will

. . . . again to Chymick flames retire
And quitt feign'd warmth, for true substantial fire:
Seek Herbs and Plants, and every healing juice,
And learn their mixture as I learn their use.
Tyson thy aid, direct my dareing course
For nature stoops to thy resistless course.

Oldmixon scornfully relates that after Pittis left Oxford he became in turn "Quack, Jacobite, and Libeller."⁶

Pittis' second epistolatory poem was addressed to one even greater than Tate. In the last year of Dryden's life he published *An epistolatory poem to John Dryden, Esq.; occasioned by the much lamented death of the Right Honourable James, Earl of Abingdon* (1699), urging the famous poet, whose *Eleanora* seven years previously had mourned the passing of the Countess of Abingdon, now to celebrate the death of her husband. The preface to the poem discloses the fact that Dryden had graciously read it before its publication, and had not only offered constructive criticism but had sent "obliging compliments" to the younger man. Pittis admitted that the poem would have been much less praiseworthy "had not Mr. Dryden acquainted me with its faults. Nothing indeed was so displeasing to him as what was pleasing to myself (viz.) his own Commendations." Pittis further admitted, with

⁵ *Miscellanies over claret*, No. 1, "The Oxford laureat."

⁶ Oldmixon, III, 510.

doubtful humility, that he always considered Dryden's judgment infallible "but in his kind thoughts of me."⁷

The group of wits who made their headquarters at the famous "Rose Tavern without Temple Gate," and fought their daily engagements of quip and jest, drew Pittis to them, and he soon began to frequent their rendezvous. Temperament and capacity eminently fitted him to make one of the merry group to which Tom Brown, D'Urfey, and others belonged. Dunton charged that as early as his Oxford days Pittis had been known as "drunken Pittis." In 1706, Dunton not only called him "a Drunkard by Profession and sucking Hogsheads thro' a Goos Quill . . . his trade,"⁸ but wrote a whole poem on his antagonist's alcoholic addictions. Pittis' capacity for wine almost excited grudging admiration from the bookseller, for he commented: "I'll say that for him, he never baulks his Liquor; He'll guzzle more at a sitting that wou'd keep a Family a month. His sound brains are potent and can bear Claret. Drinking does but cleanse and Strengthen his Skull: his Constitution is Pot-Proof."

Although there are numerous references by unsympathetic commentators to Pittis' intemperance,⁹ one might discount these more liberally if the accused were not his own worst witness. He makes such a noisy and constant display of his love for the flowing bowl, that the student of anonymous works of the period is almost brought to feel that any work shouting the delights of the bottle demands tests for Pittis' authorship.

It is not altogether surprising, then, to find that our learned rake was the chief sponsor of a periodical of which two numbers appeared in 1697, flaunting the title *Miscellanies over claret, being a collection of poems, translations, &c. to be continued monthly from the Rose Tavern without Temple Bar*. The preface to Dorset, pre-eminent among the wits of another day, declares that "As that Gentleman [Motteux] desir'd his Letters (after Postage paid) to be sent to the Coffee-House:

⁷ MS Rawlinson J. 40.1. In the Bodleian credits Pittis with a poem "On the Death of Mr. Dryden, 1700," but this and a poem described as "On King James II'd's death fol & oct." I have been unable certainly to identify from among several possibilities.

⁸ Dunton's *whipping post*, p. 26.

⁹ Dunton is particularly rich in scurrilous biographical information about Pittis. See Dunton's *whipping post*, pp. 26-30, and his *Living elegy*, pp. 19-24. For other sources see *An elegy on the death of the author of the Characters* (1699) and *The trial of skill or a new session of the poets* (1704).

We have two or three among us such exceeding Drunkards as to submit to no place but the Tavern . . . our Landlord is an honest man (that he is) tho' I believe He'll soon be weary of his Poets, for we have just now chalk'd up a Crown with him."

The writer implies that the work is the joint scheme of "Four or Five, some say Honest, others Foolish, but all say Drunken Fellows," and that he has been appointed to make the dedicatory address in order to persuade the recipient to donate something with which they might drink his health. He insists that "the Friends to the Tavern" are the "Best Friends to Poetry." This periodical, devoted solely to poetry, is of more than passing interest. Walter Graham gives it historical importance in calling it our "first real journal of poetry."¹⁰ It was not unnatural that a frequent contributor of poetry to the *Gentleman's journal* should bring out after that monthly's demise a similar journal devoted solely to verse. The major part of the first issue is taken up with a poem entitled "The Oxford laureat," and the general management of the issue, along with this poem, at least, must personally be accredited to Pittis. The proof is to be found, respectively, in the second issue of the periodical and in *Dunton's whipping post*.¹¹

"The Oxford laureat" describes an imaginary competition between aspirants for the chair of Poetry at Oxford, and contains interesting references to Tate, Yalden, Addison, Creech, and others. Addison, still at Oxford, is called a "Bookseller's cully" because he is recommended by Jacob Tonson. His appearance as a candidate for the chair is greeted thus:

Make way crys the Beadle, and advances a figure
 So much like a Writer's, you'd know it,
 'Thout observing his Papers, his looks were so meagre
 He could be nothing else but a Poet.

Poor Man! how this Son of a Dean was decay'd
 By making of Verses and Speeches!
 How Ad —— son look's since he follow'd this trade
 And let the Jade Muse wear the Breeches.

¹⁰ *English literary periodicals* (1930), p. 58.

¹¹ *Dunton's whipping post*, p. 26.

They advis'd him no more to trouble the King
 With the noise of his being a Writer;
 Because it might prove a most damnable thing,
 And hinder his Dad of the Mitre.¹²

Possibly one of the "Four or Five . . . Drunken Fellows" for whom Pittis was spokesman in the preface to *Miscellanies over claret* was Tom Brown. At any rate, the final poem of the first issue, entitled "In imitation of the 65 epig. 12 Book of Martial" is from Brown's pen and later appears in several famous popular song collections.¹³ One may notice in passing that Pittis, too, wrote at least one song which caught the popular fancy, "A song in praise of chalk." This short lyric, whose message is reminiscent of the preface to the first issue of the *Miscellanies over claret*, was reprinted in the second part of Playford's collection, *Wit and mirth or pills to purge melancholy* (1700?), to which both Brown and Pittis wrote prefatory poems. Pittis' song appears also, set to music, in D'Urfey's collection printed in 1719.¹⁴ The third verse strikes the theme of the whole:

We the Lads at the Rose
 A Patron have chose,
 Who's as void as the rest is of Thinking
 And without Dedication
 Will assist in his Station,
 And maintain us in Eating and Drinking.

The first issue of *Miscellanies over claret* announced that the work was to be continued monthly if it met with sufficient encouragement.¹⁵ The second issue contains an answer to the poem "The Oxford laureat" which clearly indicates that Pittis was the author of the original, and that in it he had offended Oxford men by a derogatory reference to "Dr. B[ee]sto[n], Head of New College. The answering poem, "A

¹² Close to a century after the appearance of this poem, Dr. Johnson quoted eight lines from it in his life of Yalden to illustrate the charges of Yalden's literary indebtedness to Congreve.

¹³ I am indebted to Dr. Benjamin Boyce, who has made a special study of Brown, for pointing out the authorship of this poem. It appeared under either the foregoing title or the title "Caella's rundlet of brandy" in several collections before 1715.

¹⁴ *Songs compleat, pleasant and divertive*, IV (1719), 183.

¹⁵ The Yale University Library possesses a copy of the rare second issue, "Printed by S.D. for J. Sturton, at the Post Office, at the Middle-Temple Gate, 1697." I have been unable to find any further issues, and suspect that after the second, with the withdrawal of Pittis' aid and direction, no further numbers were published.

letter from a gentleman at the Crown-Tavern in Oxford, to the author at the Rose Tavern without Temple-Bar," states that everyone at Oxford knew that Pittis wrote "The laureat"; it can be seen in every line. No one would "meddle with old Beeston" but one who considered that he had been injured by him, and that could only be Pittis. The Oxford versifier playfully pretends, in closing, to have some doubt, after all, that Pittis wrote "The laureat," because that poem had no name attached, and it is common knowledge that Pittis always insists on having his name on the frontispiece of everything he writes. The inclusion here of a poem so inimical to Pittis' interests is explained when one reads in the preface to this second number:

The greatest support we had in our last, and who has been very liberal in His contributions to this has now left us. The Reasons we can't dive into; some say 'tis His Mother, others His own Inclination, which has diverted him thus from a Design, he seem'd to be very forward in. Whoever it is that has prevail'd with Him, to leave His Bottle, and Friends, who had a Respect for him, we owe that Person no manner of Thanks for such an ill office.

Indications in plenty of close friendship between Tom Brown and Pittis appear about this time. There was much in the make-up of the two which would make them congenial companions. Both were men-about-town, wits, hard drinkers, and High Tories. A poem which appeared in 1700, ironically considering possible successors to Dryden's place in the literary world, notices Brown's poverty and immediately follows with comment on Pittis, saying:

Pitt-s had to the God [Apollo] his Honours done,
But knowing well Tom's Case, and his, were one,
Just as he rose, as decently sate down.¹⁶

Tom Brown's amusing doggerel "Elegy . . . upon Dobbin a coach horse" (*Works* [1720], IV, 326), probably written about this time, contains the lines:

Once more farewell, my dear belov'd Quadruped,
The Loss of thee has plainly made me stupid.
.
.
.
Since then so lame my Muse, so dull my Wit is,
I'll have thy Epitaph compos'd by Pettis.

¹⁶ A new session of the poets, occasion'd by the death of Mr. Dryden, by a person of honour (London, 1700).

In the years just previous to Brown's death, both appear not only to have had little money but to have been well acquainted with debtor's prisons. Certainly as early as 1699 Pittis had become all too familiar with the discomforts of the sponging-house. Early in that year, several scurrilous broadsides had been distributed giving short "characters" of certain people who were said to have put money into a lottery called *The ladies invention*. Some of the descriptions pointed indisputably at contemporary figures, and the verbal caricatures of the feminine contributors, at least, gave such serious offense that publisher, printer, and bookseller were arrested. Pittis, suspected of writing the offending sheets, inserted an advertisement in the *Post boy* of February 23 to deny that he had written the scandalous *Characters of several designing young gentlewomen*, and with some show of injured virtue writes that "he deals in no such matters and has more Respect for the Ladies than that comes to." Whether he actually wrote these or not, one aggrieved gentleman believed firmly that Pittis wrote a similar series about men who had contributed to the lottery, for he later gleefully wrote *An elegy on the death of the author of the Characters &c. who dyed on the 13th of this instant May at the Rose Spunging House in Woodstreet*, and the entire poem is directed at Pittis. Apparently the latter had escaped prosecution only to suffer an embarrassing forced retirement born of empty pocket. He had been compelled to forsake his beloved Rose tavern for a Rose of another name and presumably of even more questionable fragrance. The poem finished with the epitaph:

Between two Roses down I fell
 As twixt two stools a platter.
 One held me up exceeding well
 T'other did no such matter.
 The Rose by Temple-bar gave Wine
 Exchang'd for Chalk and filled me
 But being for the ready coin
 The Rose in Woodstreet kill'd me.

One interesting couplet of the poem reveals a writing affiliation at this time which I have been unable to trace further. The versifier states that

Since therefore B——t, nor his Father R——r
 Will hire a Muse to praise their Hackny Toper,

he will sing "the late departed sinner." The "Hackny Toper" can only be Pittis, and the other references are undoubtedly to Abel Roper and his partner, Richard Basset. Roper published the *Post boy*, and possibly Pittis had a hand in writing that paper at this time. *The patriots*, written by Pittis in 1702, was published by Basset.

At the close of the poem it is suggested that Ned Ward's *London spy*, which contained numerous "characters," is carrying on Pittis' muckraking and therefore his "just resemblance will not die."

How long Pittis remained in humiliating custody for debt is difficult to determine, but four years after this time one commentator, the nameless author of *Religio poetae*, implied that both the impoverished friends knew the debtor's lot all too well:

A Hell they own, a dismal place of Woe;
A dismal place! poor B——n and P—tt—s know:
Where the grim Cerb'rus shakes his Iron Chain;
Where Bawds and Bullies do for Debt remain,
And for past Pleasures suffer endless Pain.

The inclusion of the imitation of Martial in the first issue of *Miscellanies over claret* would imply a friendly relationship between Brown and Pittis as early as 1697. The attachment seems to have lasted for the remaining seven years of Brown's life, but it was apparently not without its ups and downs. In the *Post boy* of July 7, 1698, and in the *Postman* for the same date, appeared the following notice:

Mr. William Pittis, late of New Colledge. Oxon, having Scandaliz'd Mr. Brown and others, Signed the following Note yesterday July 6th, 1698. I do acknowledge that I have lately scandaliz'd Mr. Thomas Brown, in a late Half Sheet of Paper, and am sorry for doing it, and Beg his Pardon. William Pittis.

The modern student would be glad to find the evidence which the offending half-sheet should afford as to what constituted libel between one rake and another in those roistering days.¹⁷

Five years later Pittis imitated Brown's first volume of *Letters from the dead to the living* so successfully that an unscrupulous printer took the dialogues and published them, under the pretense that they were a second volume by Brown. The latter was furious, but absolved Pittis

¹⁷ Since writing these lines, I have discovered a broadside in the Gay collection of the Harvard College Library entitled *Tom Brown arrested by the Devil* (1698), and Dr. Boyce agrees with me that it may be the half-sheet referred to.

of all blame in the preface to his genuine second part, published in 1703, which stated:

Mr. P—tt—s, who Writ the greatest part of that Volume, but without any thoughts, as he affirms, of having it Father'd upon other people, has often own'd in publick Company and likewise to my self, that he knew nothing of the Sham names that are set before the several Letters, (which he wou'd have prevented, had he had the least suspicion of any such dishonest design) and that it was wholly the Bookseller's contrivance.

In June, 1704, Tom Brown died from causes unknown. In Defoe's *Review* for July 25 of that year, a pamphlet entitled *A letter from the dead Thomas Brown to the living Heraclitus with Heraclitus Ridens his answer* was advertised. This letter from the shades is directed to our former New College Fellow, of course, and follows the vogue of imaginary letters between the dead and the quick which Brown himself had developed. The letter names Heraclitus (whom he addresses as "Will") his successor, and desires news of the town from him, since he says he is the "most communicative Person breathing that I am acquainted with." Brown is represented as describing his own funeral procession, where he had noticed his old friend Heraclitus afoot while others were in carriages:

Hey day's thought I . . . one of my Intimates afoot, when others whom I was not so well acquainted with, are at the charge of Coaches to give their attendance upon me. But it's probable he's low in the Pocket, for it is not always High water with him to my knowledge.

Heraclitus Ridens answers that he is glad "you dead poets are so merry underground since most of those above are not." He apologizes for not having visited Tom during his last illness. Brown is made to say that the thing that makes death most terrible is the thought of no more claret, and parting with the "Bewitching Bottle." The whole diatribe is as full of drinking "causerie" as any early Pittis effusion.

The apparent successor to Tom Brown's place as Pittis' closest companion was another high liver and low thinker, Ned Ward, the author of the *London spy*. He had trumpeted Pittis' wit in *The Dissenting hypocrite* and, as High Tory propagandists, their paths were to run parallel for several years. Both were open Jacobites and both were pilloried for libelous publications in 1706.¹⁸ As late as 1711 they

¹⁸ Pittis for *The case of the Church of England's memorial fairly stated*, and Ward for *Hudibras redivivus*.

were on good terms, for in that year Ward's *Life and notable adventures of that renown'd knight Don Quixote de la Manche merrily translated into Hudibrastick verse* bore prefatory poems by W. King, Dr. Joseph Browne, and "W. Pittis, late Fellow of New College in Oxford." The Pittis effusion is inscribed "To my very good friend Mr. Edward Ward on his excellent version of part of the Life and Notable Adventures of Don Quixote into English Metre."

The first few years of the reign of Anne mark the former Oxonian's most prolific period. *Heracitus ridens* had appeared twice a week for eight months in 1703-4 and the *Whipping post* weekly for five months in 1705. In addition, he had published anonymously at least ten minor works during this period, for one of which he had stood in the pillory.¹⁹

The immediate calm in his affairs which followed the storm of 1705 seems to have been complete, and information concerning his activities during the next few years is relatively scarce. He was under security for his good behavior, and he doubtless came to the conclusion that, during the two-year period at least, tempting the tolerance of the powers that were was too hazardous a business for a penniless journalist. But when that time was up, even the presence of a Whig administration could not keep his pen from reflecting on people and practices inimical to Tory interests. He took care, however, while loosing his shafts, to take cover under one of the most popular literary devices of the day—the Aesopian imitation.

After the publication of L'Estrange's fables, the turn of the century had witnessed a growing number of anonymous imitations of the fables of Aesop. Frequently they served merely as vehicles of political satire, the morals appended usually having specific political or social application. Late in 1708 a collection of imitation fables entitled *Aesop at Oxford*, clearly High Tory in sentiment, appeared, having been "Printed for the Booksellers." The dedication to Thomas Lewis, Esq., Member of Parliament for Whitchurch in Hampshire, commenced:

SIR: The Character you are so worthily possess'd of, as well as the Nearness of the Place, whence these Fables took their Birth, to your Mansion House,

¹⁹ See above, p. 186. Two other works not yet mentioned should probably be included in the Pittis canon. According to a reference by Tutchin, Pittis had a hand in *Letters from the living to the living* (1703), and Dunton credits Pittis with a lost poem, *An elegy on the much lamented death of poor Truth and Honesty who departed this Life with the renown'd paper call'd the London Post on Monday the 11th of June 1705*.

makes them yours of Course; . . . What gives itself the Honour of your Name, is what a few Leisure Hours produc'd at Catharington, this Summer, and is design'd to be serviceable to the Publick, if they'll give Credit to a Hand that is retir'd and private.

But the indigent writer who had hoped for reward by appealing to the vanity of a wealthy country member of Parliament had misjudged his man. In the *London gazette* for December 9, 1708, appeared the following advertisement:

Whereas a Book hath been lately printed and published in the Name of William Pittis, Intituled, *Aesop at Oxford*; dedicated to me by the name of Thomas Lewis, Esq; Member of Parliament for Whitechurch in Hamshire; containing Reflections upon particular Persons and Communities. I do hereby declare, that I am not acquainted with the Author of the said Book, or of the Dedication or Publication thereof, ('till very lately, when a printed Copy thereof was brought to me) but do wholly disapprove of the same. Witness my hand, Thomas Lewis.²⁰

Rebuffs were common fare in Grub Street, and the former Whipster was not long in devising a new scheme to present his rejected wares to the public. Swift and Steele had made the name of Bickerstaff the toast of the town wits, and the *Tatler* was making journalistic history. Why should not the sage Isaac be made to turn his attention to the Aesopian vogue? Accordingly, *Bickerstaff's Aesop*, dedicated to the sister-universities, found its way to the bookstalls, with Mr. Bickerstaff announcing in the dedication that he felt it his duty to present these early fruits of his, since, as he says, "the Universal Reputation I once gain'd by turning Prophet, has encourag'd me of late to become a common Tatler." Regarding this volume, an article in *Harvard Library notes* points out:

There is nothing in this dedication nor elsewhere in the pamphlet, to hint of the fact that the text of pages 1-70 is identically the same as that of 'Aesop at Oxford,' 1709 . . . nothing to show whether the two pamphlets were printed at the same time, or unsold sheets of the 'Oxford' were used with new beginning and ending.²¹

The latter is, of course, the true solution. Pittis had taken bodily the old sheets of the first seventy pages of *Aesop at Oxford* and, discarding his long concluding poem on Oxford, had given his collection a new title and a new dedication, added four more fables, and issued the

²⁰ I am indebted to Mr. J. D. Briscoe, of Harvard University, for this notice.

²¹ X1 (1923), 247.

whole as a new work. The conclusion of *Bickerstaff's Aesop*, a poem of twelve lines instead of almost six pages in *Aesop at Oxford*, tells its own story:

The Sermon done, the Benediction next
Should come, to give a Blessing to the Text:
But *Aesop*, for a Blessing's at a Loss,
Who, from his Patron has not got a Cross;
Wherefore, since he with L—s cannot dine,
He, to get his Bread, turns *Palatine*;
In hopes, from such a Change, to find Relief,
And gain ten thousand *Patrons* in a *Brief*.

The inclusion of these two works in Pittis' bibliography inevitably leads the student to examine other collections in the manner of *Aesop* published about this time. The vogue was nearing its end by 1711, but in that year one of the most famous of the mock-*Aesop* collections, *Aesop at the Bell Tavern in Westminster or, a present from the October Club*, provided Tory entertainment. Close examination of this work has revealed that at the most only four of its seventeen fables had not already appeared elsewhere,²² although in all cases the application of the morals is brought up to date. Thirteen of the seventeen have been garnered from two volumes published within the preceding decade, *Canterbury tales rendred into familiar verse* (1701) and *Aesop at Oxford* (1709).²³ When Pittis added four additional fables to convert *Aesop at Oxford* into *Bickerstaff's Aesop*, he took three of them from the collection called *Canterbury tales rendred into familiar verse*. Two of these same three appear again in *Aesop at the Bell Tavern*. In one instance the publisher of *Aesop at the Bell Tavern* has taken his fable from the *Canterbury* collection and added to it a moral from *Aesop at Oxford*.

Did Pittis write *Canterbury tales rendred into familiar verse*? Whether he did or not, he seems to have taken three fables from this work for his *Bickerstaff* collection. If he did write the 1701 collection, either *Aesop at the Bell Tavern* is his or someone else has appropriated thirteen of the seventeen fables in the work from earlier Pittis collections.

²² My attention was called to the indebtedness of *Aesop at the Bell Tavern* to previous collections by the discussion in Dr. R. B. Harris' unpublished Harvard dissertation, *The beast in English satire* (1930), p. 255.

²³ Although the date on the title-page of *Aesop at Oxford* is 1709, it must have been published before December 9, 1708.

Admittedly without adequate proof, I am of the opinion that Pittis published *Aesop at the Bell Tavern*.

The short article on William Pittis in *The dictionary of national biography* notes the existence in manuscript form of an elegy written by him in 1708 on the death of Admiral Sir Cloudesley Shovell. There are no signs that this was ever published, but in the following year Pittis' name appeared on the title-page of a work which must have been a much more pleasant office for his Tory pen. It was again an elegy, and again a tribute to the memory of an Admiral, but this time in honor of Sir George Rooke, the captor of Gibraltar. The poem, about 350 lines in length, is dedicated to Lady Rooke and bears the title, *Nereo, a funeral poem sacred to the immortal memory of Sir George Rooke, Kt. lately deceased*.

One of the most unusual problems of church historians of the period has centered in a supposed work of Thomas Ken (1637-1711), Bishop of Bath and Wells, which appeared less than two months after the prelate's death—under the title of *Expostulatoria, or the complaints of the Church of England . . . by the Right Rev. Father in God, Thomas Ken, D.D.* The "editor" expressed the belief that the work had been written by Ken "some years" previously, and assured the reader that it was from the venerable bishop's pen. A sketch of Ken's life which his modern biographer, Dean Plumptre, characterizes as "not without errors"²⁴ prefaced the publication. The writing of complaints by the church over the conduct of her sons, as presented in this work, seemed utterly foreign to the known nature of Ken, and the book caused no small stir in church circles. Hearne, who stated before reading it that *Expostulatoria* was an "infamous book" and that "no Body of Understanding and Honesty" could think that Ken wrote it, hastened to qualify his original verdict after reading it, by saying:

'Tis writ in the Style of Bp. Kenn, but I much question whether it be really his. Yet 'tis very well done & I see no hurt why it may not bear so great a Name.²⁵

Hawkins, Ken's executor and great-nephew, emphatically stated in an advertisement in the *Post boy*²⁶ that the work was not Ken's, and that it was really a reprint of a pamphlet published under the title of

²⁴ E. H. Plumptre, *The life of Thomas Ken, D.D.*, I, 55.

²⁵ *Remarks and collections*, III, 171.

²⁶ May 29, 1711.

Ichabod as far back as 1663. In reviewing the case, Plumptre points out that if the pamphlet *Ichabod* could be determined to have been written by the twenty-six-year-old Ken in 1663, a whole new light would be thrown on the "early views and aspirations" of the famous prelate. Under the title "Did Ken Write *Expostulatoria*?" he devotes four finely printed pages of his biography to an examination of the problem and concludes:

On the whole then I rest on the conclusion that Ken was responsible for the *Ichabod*, and therefore for the *Expostulatoria*, and that they throw a light on his inner life and character which we cannot afford to ignore as we trace the chances and changes of his life. If not by Ken, I note the *Ichabod* and its reproductions as one of the unsolved problems of the history of the Church of the Restoration, and invite suggestions for its solution.²⁷

If Rawlinson's jottings on Pittis are correct (and there seems little reason to doubt their accuracy),²⁸ the puzzle is a puzzle no longer, and Ken is proved innocent of a work so foreign to his known temperament. Biography and fraud both seem to point inevitably to Pittis when we read in the Rawlinson ascription to him:

He republish'd a pamphlet called *Ichabod* which he sawcily fathered on Bp. Ken under the title of *Expostulatoria* or *Pathetick Complaints of the Church of England* with a preface containing some account of the life, writings and character of that Prelate Lond . .8 vo.

Much of the former Whipster's time during the four years of the Tory régime, 1710-14, must have been occupied in performing the duties of an unofficial parliamentary historian. At least four chronicles, two of which are definitely signed by the author, must be placed in the Pittis bibliography for this period. From internal evidence in the remaining two, one feels little hesitation in interpreting the "W. P." affixed to both as the initials of William Pittis.

²⁷ I, 58.

²⁸ Rawlinson MS notes on Pittis for a new edition of Wood (MS Rawl. J. 4° 1. fol. 248). These are abstracted in Hearne, II, 420. S. and M. A. Gibson, in an article on these collections in *Proceedings of the Oxford Bibliographical society*, I, Part II (Oxford, 1925), 67-95, comment on their value for bibliographers in ascertaining the authorship of anonymous works, and state (p. 74): "He mentions for instance that William Pittis 'republish'd a pamphlet called *Ichabod*, which he saucily fathered on Bp. Ken under the title of *Expostulation* [sic] or *Pathetick Complaints of the Church of England*.'" "

The Rawlinson notes also mention that Pittis wrote "Posthumous Works for Tom Brown & Mr. Butler," "The Case of Capt Leeson, Ld. Drummond for Rapes," "The Case of Mr. Dormer against Tom Jones's Adultery with his wife." These I have not yet been able sufficiently to identify to warrant discussion in this article.

It was strictly as a commentator on matters of interest to Tories that Pittis first tried his hand at writing history. His first venture was an account of *The proceedings of both Houses of Parliament in the years 1702, 1703 and 1704 upon the Bill to prevent Occasional Conformity* (1710). The dedication of this seventy-two-page work signed "W. P." is devoted, with true High Church zeal, to those who tried to tack the Occasional Conformity Bill to the Land Tax in 1703. The account was of timely interest to the Tories, for the much-disputed Occasional Conformity Bill was again one of the vexed topics of the day. In the following year Baker printed a pretentious work, three hundred and sixty-eight pages in length, entitled *The history of the present Parliament, and Convocation with the debates at large relating to the conduct of the war, etc.* It was dedicated by "W. P." to Charles Everfield, Knight, of Sussex, who, it is here asserted, had previously accepted the dedication of some of the writer's former endeavors.²⁹

Pittis signed his complete name to the 1712 history, *The history of the proceedings of the second session of this present Parliament*, and dedicated it to Sir Simeon Stuart, Chamberlain. His last known venture as a parliamentary historian reached the public in October, 1713. Dedicated to Sir William Hardress, Bart., "late Knight of the Shire for Kent and now member for Dover," *The history of the third session of the last Parliament* is of approximately the same length as its immediate predecessor, and is also signed by Pittis.

By 1712 six years had passed since Pittis had run seriously afoul of governmental displeasure. The meshes of the libel law soon entangled him again, but this time his flight from the authorities was successful. In December, 1712, he published a daring Jacobite pamphlet, *Jus sacrum, or a discourse wherein it is fully proved and demonstrated that no prince ought to be deprived of his natural right on account of religion*.³⁰ Bolingbroke, in a letter to Chief Justice Parker, April 20, 1713, inclosed the offending pamphlet along with the three Defoe pamphlets on the Succession, for which the author of the *Review* was prosecuted in 1713.³¹ Oldmixon relates that Pittis was sought for his *Jus sacrum* offense, without success.³²

²⁹ The catalogue of the British Museum prints after these two entries respectively "Edited by W.P.I.e. William Pittis" and "The dedication is signed W.P.I.e. William Pittis."

³⁰ Advertisement in the *English post*, No. 518 (Dec. 4, 1712).

³¹ State Papers, Dom. Anne, Entry Book 114.

³² III, 510.

Stern hints seem to have meant little to the unchastened "Heraclitus," for hardly eighteen months had elapsed before he was again in trouble with the authorities. This time Her Majesty's messengers seem to have been more successful. A few months after the long-awaited signing of the Treaty of Utrecht, Pittis published his *Reasons for a war with France*. The exasperated ministry seized the writer and clapped him into jail. His publisher and others went bail for him, and seem to have been able to stave off punishment, for we have no record of prosecution after Pittis' release on December 3, 1714.

The last years of the reign of Anne show two old journalistic enemies, Pittis and Defoe, writing for the same party; yet, as may well be imagined, the relationship between the two was hardly amicable. Both had sparred with each other since the days of *Heraclitus ridens*, and they now came to grips once more over the famous *White Staff* pamphlets of Defoe. His patron, Harley, having fallen from grace, Defoe published anonymously *The secret history of the White Staff* as an *apologia* for the Harley administration. Partly in the interests of Atterbury and Harcourt, and partly to equal his personal score against Harley, Pittis wrote *The secret history of the Mitre and Purse* (1714), placing the responsibility for the Staff pamphlets squarely on the shoulders of Defoe. The latter, on Harley's embarrassed repudiation of these pamphlets, had attempted to avoid credit for writing them.

Another violent paper war was on between "Perkinite Pittis" and "the prophet Daniel." Defoe countered with his *Secret history of the Secret history of the White Staff, Purse and Mitre*, and announced that he was ready to give proof that Pittis had written *The secret history of the Mitre and Purse*. Defoe charged, in his retaliatory pamphlet, that "the said Mr. Pittis own'd and acknowledg'd to him the said writer of these Sheets, that he was the Author of the said Book, call'd the Mitre and Purse, and shew'd me Part of the Copy in Manuscript before the same was printed." He announced also that he could prove who employed Pittis, and "what Hire, or Price he receiv'd for the Work."

In two places in the Yale University Library copy of a rare pamphlet called *Queen Anne vindicated from the base aspersions of some late pamphlets* (1715), the name "Mr. Wm. Pittis" is written in to indicate authorship. An inspection of the contents of this work removes any doubt that it is Pittis' second, and possibly final, bolt of the *White*

Staff controversy. Valuable to students of Defoe because of its specific charges of duplicity against Harley's versatile agent, the pamphlet protests that Pittis did not acknowledge authorship of *The history of the Mitre and Purse*, "nor shew'd him [Defoe] a line of his writing in his life." And there the matter seems to have rested.

In his career up to this time Pittis had shown as much fondness for success through scandal as he had for esteem earned by less provocative and more purely literary activity. It is hardly surprising, then, to find that the most important publishing affiliation of these later years of his life is with one of the most unscrupulous publishers the period knows—Edmund Curll. Learned, versatile, and not overnice morally, Pittis must have been looked on as a distinctly valuable addition to Curll's school of hack-writers. Defoe, who was two years later to originate the invidious term "Curlicism,"³³ had said with a sneer that Pittis had admitted being hired to write *Reasons for a war with France* "by that Conscientious Bookseller so celebrated for his Honesty, Mr. Edmund Curll in Fleet Street who was one of his Bail."³⁴

During the next four years a number of Pittis' works were printed under Curll's auspices. Yet the tendency to minimize their intrinsic importance because of tainted sponsorship must be overcome. The biographies written by Pittis in these years are important contributions to knowledge, even if anecdote and hearsay occasionally masquerade as fact. Every one of the four biographies which Pittis wrote in the period 1714–17 went to two editions or more, and in every case the biography has constituted, from that day to this, either the only source or the most complete single source of information about its subject.

Dr. John Radcliffe, famous physician of the age of Anne, whose legacies have perpetuated his name at Oxford, died a wealthy man, on November 1, 1714. He had been a man of ready wit and many eccentricities and, consequently, his life offered riches in the way of memoir and anecdote to any prospective biographer. Steele had poked fun at him as Aesculapius in the *Tatler*;³⁵ and of the plethora of stories cur-

³³ R. Straus, *The unspeakable Curll* (1927), p. 79.

³⁴ Defoe, *Secret history of the Secret history of the White Staff, Purse and Mitre* (1715), p. 23.

³⁵ July 21, 1709.

rent about this "most trusted consultant in London"³⁶ during his prime, too many had only the slightest foundation in fact. Early in the year following Radcliffe's death, Curll apparently realized that a collection of the doctor's memoirs would make interesting reading, and commissioned Pittis to gather them together in biographical form. The resulting work was published the second week in April. Hickes writing to Hearne, April 26, 1715, says: "Who wrote the Memoirs of Dr. Radcliffe? Writer seems to have been an Oxford man. Many mistakes in them. . . ."³⁷ Hearne also was of the opinion that some of the letters quoted were fictitious. However that may have been, Curll's business sense in the matter was obviously good, for the *Post boy* of April 30 announced a second edition in preparation, for which corrections and additions were welcomed in order to do justice to the memory of "such a Loyal Charitable and Publick Benefactor." A packet of letters sent from Buckinghamshire in response won the reward of six copies of the revised version, which appeared in mid-May. It represents our only substantial source of information about Radcliffe, and fourteen years after its author's death reached a fourth impression.³⁸

Pittis was not long in following up his success in this new genre, and in the fall of the year published a 360-page edition of *The works and life of the Right Honourable Charles, late Earl of Halifax*.³⁹ About one-fourth of the book is taken up by Montague's works, and the remainder contains the only ample biography of one of the greatest statesmen and literary patrons of the age of Anne. Credit for this work alone, if for no other, would entitle Pittis to a degree of historical importance among the biographers of the time which has been denied him because of the anonymity of the publication.

Curll's famous beating by the Westminster scholars in the following year forms an interesting prelude to Pittis' next biographical venture. The revered old cleric, Robert South, died on July 8, 1716, and his funeral oration was delivered by John Barber, captain of the king's

³⁶ J. B. Nias, *Dr. John Radcliffe, a sketch of his life* (1918), p. 1.

³⁷ Hearne, V, 52.

³⁸ J. B. Nias, in his thirty-page sketch of Radcliffe, while doubtful of the accuracy of "the professional writer named William Pittis" whom Curll commissioned to write Radcliffe's biography, acknowledges (p. 1) that "for our knowledge of the chief facts in Radcliffe's life we are dependent upon [this] biography." The *DNB* concurs.

³⁹ Ascription made on the authority of the Rawlinson manuscript, and Pittis' admission in the introduction to his life of Fox.

scholars at Westminster, eight days later. Curll published the speech in English and Latin as a sixpenny pamphlet, was consequently seized by the Westminster boys, and proved unable to give a negative answer to the charge

. . . . didst Thou not th' Oration print
Imperfect, with false Latin in't?⁴⁰

The subsequent thrashing and tossing of Curll delighted the souls of even more dignified enemies than the avenging schoolboys. Curll had probably already commissioned Pittis to gather materials for a life of the famous preacher.⁴¹ On July 26 he warned the reading public to disregard attacks on the proposed biography made by South's executors on the ground that it was unauthorized. He declared:

Concerning these particulars, any Person who has Authority to enquire, may receive full Satisfaction of Mr. Curll, and of which his [South's] Executors are desired to inform themselves before they consent to the Inserting of any more Scandalous Advertisements against a Work, of the Contents of which, they are wholly ignorant.⁴²

The vehemence of the protest from South's executrix probably derived intensity from the fact that she was in the process of easy preparation of South's sermons for publication. Nevertheless, in October Pittis' work, *The life of Dr. Robert South, with a true copy of his . . . last will and testament, with 3 sermons*, was published for Curll. In the following year Pittis made a collection of extracts from South's sermons and published them under the title of *Maxims, sayings, explications of Scripture phrases, descriptions and characters, extracted from the writings of Dr. South* (1717). It was not his hand which assembled the materials for the enlarged edition of South's works which Curll published in the same year, although his *Life of South* was included in the

⁴⁰ *Neck or nothing* (1716).

⁴¹ An amusing popular ballad, entitled "The battle royal," which appeared early in the nineties at the time of the South-Sherlock exchange in connection with the Socinian controversy, is mentioned in the *DNB* article on South as being ascribed to William Pittis. This ballad is included in Pittis' life of South, prefixed to the Oxford, 1842, edition of the sermons (pp. xcii-iii), with the statement that the ballad was translated into several languages and "presents were made to the author by the nobility and gentry." It is also to be found in the columns of the *Orphan reviv'd*, No. 50, in a letter submitted to Mrs. Powell, the publisher of that journal. The poem is here said to have been "written by a Person who is supposed to have a Hand in your Paper, more than twenty years since . . . which did not a little contribute at that Time to a Royal Injunction for prohibiting all such cavils for the future." Pittis himself probably wrote these words. See below, n. 46.

⁴² Advertisement at end of *The character of the reverend learned Dr. Robert South*.

collection. In attempting to escape from the opprobrium of being called one of Curll's hacks, Pittis later firmly announced in the person of the author, while speaking of his life of South, that "things have been crowded into the last for Posthumous Works which he does not hold himself answerable for."⁴³ The enlarged edition, boldly containing the *Oratio Funebris*, is listed in the British Museum catalogue as *Posthumous works of . . . R. South, containing sermons on several subjects: an account of his travels into Poland with the Earl of Rochester . . . 1674; memoirs of his life and writings etc. (Oratio funebris, etc.) 3 pt. London (1717)*. In 1721 a second edition of the *Memoirs of the life of Dr. South containing, etc.*, was published. Again Pittis as biographer is alone in the field, for no other substantial biography of South is known to exist. The biography which precedes the Oxford Press edition of South's sermons is that which Pittis wrote and published under Curll's sponsorship in 1717.⁴⁴

The last attempt at biography by Pittis which records disclose was his *Memoirs of the life of Sir Stephen Fox*. First published in 1717, this work was reprinted twice almost a hundred years later, once in 1807 and again in 1811. The preface is illuminating, for it shows the existence of some remaining spark of independence and self-respect in the Oxford Fellow of another day, when he complains loudly of having been misrepresented as one of "Mr. Curll's hacks" and "Triobularian scribblers."⁴⁵

The remaining seven years of Pittis' life are singularly barren of information concerning his activities. Possibly his association with Curll lasted only for the three or four years during which he turned biographer. He may have terminated his humiliating connection with the unscrupulous publisher about the time he published his life of Fox, as the preface to that work seems to indicate. Whether he did or not, record of only one certain work from the former Whipster's pen can be found in the closing years of his life, and that is a work apparently of secondary importance even in the career of a professional

⁴³ Preface to *Memoirs of the life of Sir Stephen Fox* (1717).

⁴⁴ The three sermons printed with the 1717 *Life* are added to Vol. V of the Oxford Press edition (1842).

⁴⁵ This curious adjective appears also in *Heracitus ridens, the Whipping post, Queen Anne vindicated, and the Orphan reviv'd*, No. 51.

journalist.⁴⁶ In 1722 Pittis wrote an account of a famous criminal case of the day, which arose over the murder of Captain Edward Lutterell, "only son of Mr. Lutterell the famous painter in crayons." The first thirteen words of the 163-word title indicate the contents of the pamphlet—*The widow Lutterell's cry for justice, for the blood of her murdered husband*.

Two years later at his quarters in the Inner Temple, from which thirty years before he had sauntered fresh from Oxford to meet the wits at the Rose, William Pittis went to join the shades of those happier days. Times which could boast toleration for the Dissenter, security for a king from Hanover, and supremacy for the Whigs, must have been very much out of joint for the Jacobite Whipster. Perhaps the end was not unwelcome to the man of whom "crazy" Dunton had sagely remarked, "He lives as if he had been sent into the World to steer by the Compass of his own Inclinations; as if the present were the sole Theatre of Things and Futurity either past or nothing but a Bug-bear."⁴⁷

Of over fifty works, small and large, which can with reasonable certainty be accredited to the pen of Pittis, not more than a dozen bear his name. Consequently, structural work on the biography of this Tory rake of another day offers more than the usual number of technical problems. The hunt for proper building materials leads oftener to the obscure scrap-pile than to the popular and well-stocked warehouse. And when the edifice is as complete as present craftsmanship and available tools can make it, the resulting structure is hardly a thing of beauty. It is the depressing story of youth's failure to fulfil its promise. It is the record of a scholar's reduction to the life of a Grub street mercenary—a mercenary, however, be it said, who even in the direst of straits never swerved in his allegiance to church and party.

⁴⁶ Since writing these lines, I have been led by James R. Sutherland to proof that Pittis had a prominent part in the writing of yet another daring Jacobite periodical, the *Orphan revis'd or Powell's weekly journal* (1719–20). A warrant for Pittis' arrest on a charge of writing No. 23 (April 25, 1719) is to be found in the Public Records Office (S.P. 44/79a), and the journal itself offers convincing internal evidence of Pittis' pen.

⁴⁷ Dunton's *whipping post*, p. 27.

He had his finger in many literary pies, and his efforts bespeak a versatility not entirely born of gaping purse and empty tankard. He was the moving spirit in the publication of at least three periodicals of his time; he wrote four contemporary histories, five useful biographies, and a host of occasional pieces. Admittedly the praise to be allotted must be more often that for ambition and industry than for the highest skill; and yet, frequently when possessing least literary merit, the works of the "laughing Heraclitus" are, paradoxically enough, important for that very reason. It is often when he is most scurrilous that Pittis is most valuable to the student in presenting new light on people and problems of another day. In this fact, if in no other, lies justification for an attempt to pull aside the veil of anonymity behind which William Pittis has remained hidden for over two centuries.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

A NOBLE SAVAGE ON THE STAGE

WILLIAM HUSE

I

FOR the Christmas season of 1785 the management of the Theatre Royal in Covent Garden prepared an elaborate pantomime called *Omai, or, a trip round the world*. The titular figure in this entertainment was the South Sea Islander whom Captain Furneaux, Cook's second in command on the voyage of 1772-75, brought back to England on the "Adventure." The first performance of the pantomime, December 20, 1785, inaugurated a gratifying success. During the season of 1785-86 *Omai* was played fifty times, once by royal command; in the fall of 1786 it was given eight times more; and in the spring of 1788 it was revived for another eight performances.¹ The printed "account of the new pantomime called *Omai*," which sold into a third edition in 1785, brought the author about £40 in addition to the £100 paid him by the theatre.²

In 1785 *Omai* created a small sensation. Today it is almost entirely forgotten. Only a few copies of the text survive;³ and discussions of the eighteenth-century interest in the noble savage do not mention it at all. In part this oblivion is deserved. *Omai* has small literary merit. The songs could have been written by any rhymester with a turn for makeshift humor and turgid sentiment. The plot displays more ingenuity than imagination. The characterization of *Omai* himself merely reiterates the current sentimental idealization of the noble

¹ These data were compiled from the collection of Covent Garden playbills in the Huntington Library. The author of *Omai*, John O'Keeffe (*Recollections*, II, 114-15), says that the pantomime was "acted forty nights the first season," and that "Their Majesties commanded 'Omai' often." But he was recollecting in 1826, after an interval of forty years.

² *Recollections of the life of John O'Keeffe, written by himself* (2 vols.; London, 1826), II, 114.

³ The text of *Omai* survives in three states. (1) The MS copy submitted to the censor. This is now in the Larpent Collection of the Huntington Library. (2) A "new edition," published in London in 1785. Six copies have been located in the United States and the British Isles. (3) A "second edition," also published in London in 1785. The only copy which I have been able to locate is in the Yale University library. Of the presumable first edition I have been able to discover no copy.

Although among these texts there are numerous variations, I shall not attempt here to establish priority, as that question has no bearing on my present interest in *Omai*.

[MODERN PHILOLOGY, February, 1936]

savage. Nevertheless, there are two reasons why the pantomime is worth resuscitating for comment here. In the first place, it furnishes an instructive example of how diverse elements of popular interest can be combined to produce a popular success. And, second, the pantomime has an important place in the history of realism in theatrical costume and scenery.

II

For a number of years previous to 1785 the Covent Garden management had produced, for each Christmas season, a spectacular pantomime.⁴ After several years of success, the offerings for 1783 and 1784 were comparative failures.⁵ Consequently, for 1785 a special effort was necessary. This was intrusted to John O'Keeffe, a minor dramatist who had already established a connection with the Covent Garden Theatre as a writer of comedies and of two earlier Christmas pantomimes. To insure success, he chose to capitalize contemporary enthusiasm over Captain James Cook and his voyages.

Although the "Resolution" and the "Discovery" had returned to England as early as 1780 with the news of Cook's tragic death in the Sandwich Islands, it was not until 1784 that the admiralty published the account of the expedition. The extent of public interest in Cook and his discoveries can be seen in the wide demand for the published account not only of this voyage but of its predecessor. Six editions of the two voyages were issued in 1784-85.⁶

This interest in Cook, and a lively curiosity about the strange and remote places he had visited, furnished a ready source of material for O'Keeffe in his attempt to provide the Covent Garden Theatre with a popular success. O'Keeffe's problem was to use as much as he could of the diverse materials of the voyages; to capitalize Cook's fame while

⁴ In their characteristic form these pantomimes contained lyrics but no dialogue. The text of *Omai* consists of descriptions of the scenes, stage directions, and the words of the songs.

⁵ The 1783 pantomime, *Friar Bacon; or, Harlequin's adventures in Lilliput, Brobdignag, &c.*, ran for only seventeen performances. One scene from it was salvaged for its immediate successor the same season, *Harlequin rambler, or, the convent in an uproar*. This died after twenty-two performances. The 1784 pantomime, *The magic cavern; or virtue's triumph*, ran thirty-six nights the first season and four nights during the fall of 1785. These data are gathered from the Covent Garden playbills for 1783-85.

⁶ 1784: *Journal of the third voyage*, 3 vols.

Two abridgments of the above.

Journal of the second voyage, 2 vols., 2d ed. (1st ed., 1777).

1785: *Journal of the third voyage*, 3 vols, 2d ed.

The same, 3 vols., 3d ed.

avoiding the bad taste of making the circumnavigator a figure in a pantomime; and to provide some sort of unity for the whole concoction.

The accounts of the second and third voyages supplied a convenient central figure in Omai; and his personal history provided some slight basis for an episodic plot which could include all the desired variety of scene. To be sure, when O'Keeffe was writing, a decade had already passed since Omai, as the protégé of Lord Sandwich, had been a sensation and a curiosity in England. But the widespread interest in Cook's journal, after its publication in 1784, must have brought Omai again to the public mind, for in that record he figures largely as Cook's interpreter and companion; and a long section of the narrative tells how he was finally left on one of the Society Islands.

Though it was Omai whom O'Keeffe chose as his hero, it was Omai with a difference. The journal of the second voyage gives the sober facts about him.⁷ His father, a native of Ulitea, had been deprived of his land when the island was conquered by warriors from the neighboring Bolabola. Omai hoped that on his return he would be able, through Cook's intervention, to recover his inheritance. When Captain Furneaux first formed the project of taking Omai back to England, Cook disapproved on the ground that Omai was not representative of the best type of Society Islander, and would have preferred taking another young native, Oediddee.

Though this situation was obviously too prosaic for the sort of taste that found Omai's native songs "disgusting" because they lacked the note of wild romantic melancholy, the real state of affairs provided a starting-point for the desired kind of plot. In the pantomime, instead of being the son of a dispossessed landholder, Omai is made the son and heir of Otoo, descendant of the legal kings of Otaheite. Aided by Towha, "the Guardian Genius of Omai's Ancestors, and Protector of the legal Kings of Otaheite," Omai is to recover the kingship. Oediddee as the rival claimant was no doubt suggested by Cook's preference for the latter.

⁷ James Cook, *A voyage towards the south pole* (London, 1777), I, 169. See also Cook, *A voyage to the Pacific ocean* (London, 1784), II, 92-93. These will be referred to hereafter as Cook (1777) and Cook (1784), respectively. The record of Cook's first voyage was published in Hawkesworth's *Voyages* (London, 1773), Vols. II and III. Cook's own journal of this voyage was not published until 1893.

The patriotic chord is sounded when Britannia transports Omai to England, where he is to claim his destined bride, Londina, in a match which will further cement the bonds between England and the South Seas. To all of this O'Keeffe added a stock element of pantomime, the Harlequin motive. Harlequin is introduced as Omai's servant, Columbine as Londina's maid, and the Clown as the servant of Don Struttolando, Omai's rival for the hand of Londina. The return trip from England, involving stops at many of the places Cook had touched at in his voyages, gives the dramatist opportunity to exploit interest in exotic geography. Upon Omai's safe return, with Londina, to Otaheite, he is confirmed in his kingship; and the patriotic note is struck again in a choral tribute to Cook, sung by an English captain and sailors as a portrait of the circumnavigator is lowered onto the stage.

This farrago, in outline, does not suggest much indebtedness to Cook. Nevertheless, for details O'Keeffe drew heavily, though in a haphazard fashion, on the accounts of both the second and the third voyages. The names of most of the characters are the names of actual Society Islanders whom Cook mentions. But, like Omai, under O'Keeffe's touch they emerge as something new and strange. The real Oediddee, who accompanied the expedition for a while on the 1777 voyage, was a "near relation" of Opoony, chief of the island of Bola-bola. In Cook's opinion he "would have been a better specimen of the nation, in every respect, than Omai."⁸ Oberea, who appears in the pantomime as the "Protectress" of Oediddee and "an Enchantress," was actually, in 1767, queen of one of the islands. On the second voyage Cook learned that she had become "poor, and of little consequence."⁹ Otoo, who becomes Omai's father in the pantomime, was in reality the reigning prince of Otaheite.¹⁰ Towha, who becomes the "Guardian Genius of Omai's Ancestors . . .," was actually a kinsman of Otoo and chief of one district of the island.¹¹ For one minor character, an "Otaheitean, supposed to have accompanied Omai to England," O'Keeffe specified a motley costume, acknowledging that

⁸ Cook (1777), I, 375. Oediddee is encountered again on the third voyage; see Cook (1784), II, 25-26.

⁹ Hawkesworth, II, 105; Cook (1777), II, 159; (1784), II, 13.

¹⁰ Hawkesworth, II, 154; Cook (1777), I, 148; (1784), II, 21.

¹¹ Cook (1784), II, 30, 46-48.

the suggestion for it was "taken from Cook's Voyages, where it is said, that Omai, to make himself fine on his introduction to a Chiefs [*sic*] dressed himself with a piece of the habit of each country he had seen in his several voyages."¹²

From the foregoing it is clear that the South Sea Island characters in the pantomime represent wide departures from their historical originals. In the main, the credit for plot and characterization can be given almost entirely to O'Keeffe, and that without paying him any great compliment. The truth is, apparently, that the dramatist's chief interest lay in securing local color, and Cook conveniently supplied him with a set of authentic character names.

In this attempt at local color O'Keeffe also drew upon Cook for native terms and place-names, which he introduced into the stage directions and songs of the pantomime. Through the text are sprinkled twenty-three native terms and seven place-names, all of them glossed in footnotes. The superficiality of O'Keeffe's information appears in some of these glosses. The "Mogee fish," for instance, is explained as "an excellent species of fish in those waters";¹³ and the "wharrapalm," as a "particular palm."¹⁴ For the glosses O'Keeffe obviously relied upon his reading of Cook, who was careful to explain any native terms which he used. Of the thirty glossed words, the explanations of all but one are to be found in the journals of the voyages.

That O'Keeffe relied upon Cook for these glosses is best shown by the fact that the dramatist's three errors are the result, unmistakably, of a hasty and careless reading of the text. O'Keeffe uses the native word *kabulla*, "a delicate and fragrant flower."¹⁵ In Cook the word occurs as *kahulla*.¹⁶ The voyage accounts italicize all native terms; and in the font of italic used, *b* and *h* are so similar that they can be distinguished only by careful scrutiny. O'Keeffe's second mistake was to gloss "Maoaian gales" as "Western breezes."¹⁷ Cook explains the term as follows:

If the wind should veer farther to the Southward, and then become South East, or South South East, it then blows more gently, with a smooth sea,

¹² Omai, footnote to the cast of characters. The Otaheitean does not appear in the cast of characters in the "second edition." This and the following references to Omai are to the "new edition." For the original episode see Cook (1784), II, 15.

¹³ Omai, p. 5.

¹⁶ Cook (1784), I, 388.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹⁷ Omai, p. 3.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

and is called *Maoai*. In those months, when the sun is nearly vertical, . . . the winds and weather are both very variable; but it frequently blows from the West North West, or North West. This wind is what they call *Toerou*. . . .¹⁸

If anyone were reading so rapidly that his eye caught the word *Maoai* and only the one sentence following, he would have precisely the combination to explain O'Keeffe's mistake. The third error can be accounted for on the same assumption of hasty reading. O'Keeffe wrongly glosses *taro* as "bread-fruit."¹⁹ Cook, telling of his stay on one of the islands, writes: ". . . they [the natives] brought, at different times, roots which they call *taro* (the *cocos* of other countries); a breadfruit; and. . . ." ²⁰ Here the dramatist obviously failed to notice the first semicolon and thus identified *taro* as breadfruit.

Authentic character names, exotic additions to vocabulary, and possible suggestions for plot—all these do not complete the sum of O'Keeffe's levy upon the journals of Cook's voyages. The pantomime contains, in all, seventeen scenes. Five of these, which display Omai's adventures in England, need not concern us here. The other twelve scenes all represent places described in the voyages, and include such picturesque spots as a burial place in Otaheite, summer and winter dwellings of the Kamchatkans, a village in the Friendly Islands, a view of the great bay of Otaheite.

For the high point of the last scene, a spectacular procession, O'Keeffe again drew heavily upon Cook. Processions of this sort had been included before in Covent Garden productions. They had been features of the Christmas pantomimes of 1780 and 1781; they had been used in other pieces in 1784 and 1785.²¹ In adding a procession to *Omai* as in adding Harlequin, Columbine, and the Clown, O'Keeffe was only following his policy of including elements which had proved successful in the past. The difference was that the procession in *Omai* was to be bigger and better than any of its predecessors. Its fourteen sections constituted a kind of visual summary of Cook's voyages: it was composed of actors representing the natives of a dozen different places which Cook had visited.

¹⁸ Cook (1784), II, 142-43.

¹⁹ *Omai*, p. 17.

²⁰ Cook (1784), I, 197.

²¹ Cf. Covent Garden playbills for those years.

This reliance on Cook, though extensive, is certainly superficial and haphazard. The preposterous plot is only an excuse to assemble a variety of details, all highly suggestive of people and places far off and strange. And the conclusion, the lowering of a great portrait of Cook and the singing of a song in his honor, serves as a last gesture toward popular enthusiasm for England's great explorer.

III

However much O'Keeffe exploited interest in Cook and his discoveries in the text of the pantomime, the final success of the piece must still depend upon striking qualities in costume and scenery. To separate text from production is a convenience for the sake of discussion, but it creates a distinction which never existed. The two were worked out interdependently; and a large part of O'Keeffe's task was to create opportunities for the designer of costumes and scenery.

For the production of *Omai* the regular staff of the Covent Garden Theatre was augmented by several new artists, of whom the most outstanding was Philip James de Loutherbourg. Loutherbourg was a French artist who, upon coming to England in 1771, had been immediately added by Garrick to the producing staff of the Drury Lane Theatre. His first work for Garrick, *The Christmas tale*, December 23, 1773, is said to have "inaugurated a new era in scene-painting. . . ."²² Besides working in the theatre, Loutherbourg was a landscape and portrait painter; in 1781 he was elected to membership in the Royal Academy. He was, strictly speaking, a designer rather than a scene-painter. In design, his chief interest lay in accomplishing greater effects of realism and in introducing movement into the scene itself. This innovation he used successfully for the Armada battle scene in Sheridan's *Critic*, for which he designed the scenery in 1779. O'Keeffe summarizes Loutherbourg's achievement as follows:

He had . . . invented transparent scenery—moonshine, sunshine, fire, volcanoes, &c. as also breaking the scene into several pieces by the laws of perspective, showing miles and miles distance. Before his time, the back was one broad flat, the whole breadth and height of the stage.²³

The engagement of Loutherbourg, who had not been previously connected with Covent Garden, was clear enough indication that

²² *DNB*.

²³ *Recollections*, II, 114.

something unusual was being attempted. Some weeks before *Omai* was presented, the *Morning chronicle* announced that

the new pantomime at Covent Garden will be aided by some of the great painters in the manner of *The Jubilee*, to which Dance, Cipriani, Angelica, etc., all contributed. Thus, with Loutherbouurg, Peters is already at work, and it is hoped that Gainsborough, Cipriani, and Farington will also be volunteers.²⁴

This hope was disappointed; but the names of several other artists who had a hand in the production were listed in the playbills, which advertised

. . . the Whole of the Scenery, Machinery, Dresses, &c. &c. Designed and Invented by Mr. LOUTHERBOURG, and Executed under his Superintendence and Direction by Messrs. RICHARDS, CARVER, and HODGINGS, Mr. CATTON, jun. Mr. TURNER, Assisted By Two Other Celebrated Artists.²⁵

Richards, Carver, and Hodgins were regular designers and painters for the Covent Garden Theatre; their names appear on the playbills of many other productions. Before the advent of Loutherbouurg, Richards apparently designed the scenery and Carver was the principal painter, for O'Keeffe recalls

My castle, forest, cavern, undermining,
By Carver painted, Richard's first designing.²⁶

Richards, who was a member of the Royal Academy, began his career as scene-painter for the Dublin Theatre, was brought to Drury Lane by Garrick, whence he followed his friend Spranger Barry, the Irish actor, to Covent Garden. Carver belonged to the Incorporated Society of Artists; Hodgins, originally a Dubliner, was one of his pupils. Catton was son of one of the foundation members of the Royal Academy. All except Catton were exhibitors from time to time at the Royal Academy and the Free Society of Artists.²⁷ One of the "Two Other Celebrated Artists" mentioned in the playbill was the Rev. William Peters, chaplain to the Royal Academy, whom the *Morning chronicle* had mentioned earlier as "already at work." Perhaps Peters felt that his clerical dignity precluded the printing of his name on the playbill.

²⁴ Quoted by W. T. Whitley, *Artists and their friends in England, 1700-1799* (London and Boston, 1928), II, 353.

²⁵ Covent Garden playbills, 1785 and 1786.

²⁶ *Recollections*, II, 421.

²⁷ For Richards, Carver, and Catton see *DNB*; for Hodgins and Turner, *Bryan's dictionary of painters and engravers*, ed. and rev. George C. Williamson (London, 1921).

Even this collection of talent, however, does not tell the whole story of the production. The admiralty had appointed John Webber as official artist to accompany Cook on the third voyage.²⁸ From Webber's drawings the engravings were made which illustrate the published account of the voyage. These engraved plates include views of the various regions which Cook visited, portraits of the natives, and detailed drawings of their dress, weapons, etc. Besides this published material, O'Keeffe had the advantage of "much conversation on the subject . . . with Mr. Webber and Commodore Phillips."²⁹ Louthembourg, too, may have had some contact with the returned voyagers, for among his effects (sold June 18, 1812) was a collection of costumes containing "many Otaheitean dresses, no doubt used by him in staging Omai. . . ."³⁰

The pantomime seems to have been planned to take the fullest advantage of Webber's materials. In fact, O'Keeffe himself testifies that "the dresses and scenery were done from drawings of Mr. Webber."³¹ In the course of the voyage Webber must have made a good many more sketches than he finally used as illustrations for the published journal;³² and it is highly probable that O'Keeffe and Louthembourg had seen these. Curiously enough, however, there is relatively little in the pantomime that cannot be accounted for by the engraved plates. Of course there is a wide possibility of error in attempting to draw definite conclusions from the rather brief indications of scene, etc., given in the pantomime. Still, the fact remains that O'Keeffe's descriptions and the titles of the plates are frequently too close to be explained by coincidence.

Scene I, Part I, is "*A Morai in Otaheite by Moonlight.*" Plate XXXIII (1784) shows "*A MORAI, in ATOOI.*" During the course of Scene I, O'Keeffe gives the stage direction, "*Towha assumes the*

²⁸ William Hodges, the official artist of the second voyage, went to India a few years after his return and stayed there until 1784.

²⁹ *Recollections*, II, 114. In the list of men who accompanied Cook on his third voyage ([1784], I, 11) there is a lieutenant of marines, Molesworth Philips. He and O'Keeffe's "Commodore Phillips" may be the same man.

³⁰ W. T. Whitley, *Art in England, 1800-1820* (Cambridge, England, 1928), p. 194.

³¹ *Recollections*, II, 114; see also "Webber," *DNB*, and Whitley, *Artists and their friends in England*, II, 353.

³² Webber published, 1787-92, a series of sixteen views of the places visited on the voyage, colored and etched by himself. These were printed in a volume in 1808. Some of the Cook voyage pictures are now in the Victoria and Albert Museum.

Appearance of a Chief Mourner." Here the source for the indicated costume is almost certainly an illustration, this time one of the engravings from the journal of the second voyage. There Plate XLIV ([1777] I, 184) is described as "A TOUPAPOW WITH A CORPSE ON IT *Attended by the Chief Mourner in his Habit of Ceremony.*" In the left foreground is a figure in elaborate ceremonial costume—mask, high headdress, robes, etc. Scene I, Part II, is "A View of the Balagans of Kamtschatka, (on the Eastern Coast of Asia)"; Plate LXXVII (1784) is "SUMMER and WINTER HABITATIONS [i.e., balagans and jouts], in KAMTSCHATKA." Scene II is "Inside of a Jourt"; Plate LXXVIII (1784) is "The INSIDE of a WINTER HABITATION [i.e., a jourt], in KAMTSCHATKA." Scene III is "A dreary Ice Island"; Plate XXX ([1777], I, 36) is "THE ICE ISLANDS, seen the 9:th of Jan:^{ry} 1773."

The correspondence is considerably closer between the members of the procession and pictures of the natives. Here O'Keeffe and Loutherbourg used, as in the foregoing scenes, Hodges's illustrations for the second voyage as well as Webber's for the third:

PROCESSION	PLATES
I. A dancing Girl of <i>Otaheite</i> . Six Men of <i>Otaheite</i> (as Attendants preceding)	XXIX (1784) A YOUNG WOMAN of OTAHEITE, <i>Dancing</i> .
II. One Chief of <i>New Zealand</i> . Two Warriors ditto. One common Man, ditto	LV (1777) A MAN OF NEW ZEALAND
One Woman with a Child, ditto.	LXIII (1777) FAMILY IN DUSKY BAY, NEW ZELAND [four figures against a scenic background, one a woman with a child tied on her back in a kind of blanket-coat].
III. One Chief of <i>Tanna</i> . Two Men of ditto.	XXVI (1777) MAN OF THE ISLAND OF TANNA
One Woman of ditto.	XLV (1777) WOMAN OF THE ISLAND OF TANNA
IV. One Chief of <i>Marquesas</i> . Two Men of ditto.	XXXVI (1777) THE CHIEF AT S ^{TA} CHRISTINA [one of the Marquesas Islands].

PROCESSION

PLATES

- V. One Chief of *Friendly Islands*. XL (1777) OTAGO [a chief at Amsterdam in the Friendly Islands].
 Four Men of ditto. XVIII (1784) *POULAHO, KING of the FRIENDLY ISLANDS*.
 XX (1874) *POULAHO . . . drinking KAVA* [this picture contains a large number of other male figures].
- VI. One Chief of *Sandwich Islands*.
 Seven Men of ditto (plain Helmets.) LXIV (1784) *A MAN of the SANDWICH ISLANDS, with his HELMET* [a reference to the text, III, 4, identifies this figure in the feather helmet as Kaneena, a chief].
 One Chief of ditto (feathered Helmets.)
 Seven men of ditto (with ditto.)
- VII. One Chief of *Easter Island*. XLVI (1777) MAN OF EASTER ISLAND.
 Two Men of ditto.
- VIII. One Chief of *Tschutski Tartars*. LI (1784) *The TSCHUKTSCHI, and their HABITATIONS*.
 Four Men of ditto.
 One Woman of ditto.
- IX. One Russian.
 Two Russian Women.
- X. One Chief of *Kamtschatka*. LXXV (1784) *A MAN of KAMTSCHATKA*.
 Four Men of ditto. LXXVI (1784) *A WOMAN of KAMTSCHATKA*.
 One Woman and a Child, ditto. XXXVIII (1784) *A MAN of NOOTKA SOUND*.
 XI. Two Men of *Nootka Sound*. XXXIX (1784) *A WOMAN of NOOTKA SOUND* [Pl. XLI, "A VIEW of the HABITATIONS in NOOTKA SOUND," contains both male and female figures in the foreground].
 One Woman of ditto.
- XII. Two Men of *Oonalashka*. XLVIII (1784) *A MAN of OONALASHKA*.
 One Woman of ditto. XLIX (1784) *A WOMAN of OONALASHKA*.

PROCESSION	PLATES
XIII. Two Men of <i>Prince William's Sound</i> . One Woman of ditto.	XLVI (1784) <i>A MAN of PRINCE WILLIAM'S SOUND</i> . XLVII (1784) <i>A WOMAN of PRINCE WILLIAM'S SOUND</i> .
XIV. The Otaheitean Girl with Presents to the Captain. Twelve Otaheitean Dancers.	XXVII (1784) <i>A YOUNG WOMAN of OTAHEITE, bringing a PRESENT</i> . XXVIII (1784) <i>A DANCE in OTAHEITE</i> [male and female figures].
XV. The English Captain and Sailors.	

Even where there is no close correspondence between the setting or the member of the procession, and a particular plate, there is always the possibility that the fabricators of the pantomime found some useful detail in one or another of the illustrations. The picture of the Kamchatkan jourt, for instance, includes several figures;³³ and while Plate LIII, "*The Island of OTAHETE bearing S.E. distant one League*,"³⁴ does not correspond exactly with the last scene of the pantomime, "*A View of the Great Bay of Otaheite . . .*," it may well have supplied various details.

The plates of the 1777 and 1784 voyages do not, of course, constitute the only sources, besides consultation with Webber, to which O'Keeffe and Louthembourg could turn. Cook, and after him Captain King, who continued the journal of the third voyage, were both scrupulous in setting down descriptions of the people and places that came under their observation. Native dwellings, boats, costumes, weapons, etc., were all observed and described in detail. In *Omai*, Scene IV, Part II, is "*A Village in Tongataboo . . .*"; Cook gives a detailed account of such a village.³⁵ A stage direction in the same scene reads, "*The Natives enter, fabricating their feathered Garments . . .*"; Cook tells of the feathered cloaks brought by the natives for barter,³⁶ and adds how one such garment was given him.³⁷ In Section X of the procession, one of the figures is a "*Chief of Kamtschatka*."

³³ Cook (1784), Pl. LXXVIII.

³⁴ (1784), I, 282-83.

³⁵ Cook (1777), I, 180.

³⁶ (1784), II, 206.

³⁷ (1784), I, 286. These feathered garments were common to both the Sandwich and Friendly islands. If O'Keeffe was using the journal for material here, he transferred a few elements from one group of islands to the other. But Cook (1784), I, 297, comments on the similarity of custom in both places.

King describes the ceremonial dress of a "Toion" (or chief). A dress of this kind was given him as a present. Other members of the expedition must undoubtedly have brought home various articles with them; and such souvenirs may very well have supplied models for further realism in costume.

The value of this realism as a drawing card is evident in the playbills, which list among other attractions of the pantomime, "a PROCESSION of the Inhabitants of . . . [thirteen places are enumerated] and the other countries visited by Captain Cook, exactly representing their Dresses, and Weapons."

IV

This fidelity to realism was not, in 1785, entirely new. Whenever it was used, however, it was sufficiently novel to be made a point of in playbills. For *Barataria; or, Sancho turn'd governor*, the bill advertised "A grand Baratarian procession of Sancho to his government. The characters all dressed in the habits of the times."³⁸ O'Keeffe records with considerable pride that in 1782, when he was preparing an earlier Covent Garden pantomime, he and Harris, the manager, spent a whole morning in the Tower, "among armouries, warders, and horse-mounted kings,"³⁹ to check up on the correctness of certain details. Realism in scenery and costuming were not an innovation in *Omai*.

Both, however, were combined; and both were carried out more completely than had ever been attempted before. Out of what had originated as a bid for popular success by capitalizing interest in Captain Cook, came unexpected and far-reaching results. The announcement in the *Morning chronicle* implied that the "new pantomime at Covent Garden" was to represent an unusual effort on the part of the management.⁴⁰ *Omai* was Louthembourg's last work as a designer, and his most successful. It was more ambitious than anything else of the kind ever attempted before.⁴¹ Sir Joshua Reynolds, like many other artists, was present at the first night. Allowed to sit in the orchestra for a better view, he "expressed the utmost satisfaction at all the land-

³⁸ Covent Garden playbills, 1784-85.

³⁹ *Recollections*, II, 24.

⁴⁰ The manager, Harris, wrote to O'Keeffe that no passes could be given to *Omai* "on account of the immensity of expense" involved in its production (*Recollections*, II, 328).

⁴¹ Whitley, *Artists and their friends in England*, II, 353.

scape scenes."⁴² A contemporary review characterized *Omai* as "... in point of subject, arrangement, scenery, and music, ... much superior to any Entertainment of the kind on the English stage."⁴³ It was so superior, in fact, that it set a standard from which the Covent Garden management could not afford to recede:

The success of this elegant entertainment seems to have stamped a character upon the theatre itself, which has since constantly adhered to it. The manager, fully alive to the interests he had excited, secured systematically, the materials of his triumph. Artists of great merit were engaged in his painting-room; and he constantly kept together a set of pantomime actors, the best in the profession. ... His machinery was well served, his processions were arranged with skill.⁴⁴

Granting that the management's concern was primarily with profits and only secondarily with the improvement of stage resources, the result was still the same. The materials were assembled and the motive provided for more attention to costume and setting. It is true that these improvements were applied, for the great part, to spectacles, and that *Othello* might still be dressed in English regimentals and a "three-cocked" gold-laced hat.⁴⁵ Attention to historical detail and local color, in drama of more intrinsic importance, had still to wait for the Kembles.⁴⁶ But whatever the interest of *Omai* for people who saw it at Covent Garden, its interest for us lies finally in the fact that it demonstrated the successful possibilities of realism in costume and design, set up a machinery for their execution, and furnished a motive for their continued use. All the materials, then, were assembled and ready for the time when such careful attention might be given to plays which were certainly far more worth the effort involved.

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 354.

⁴³ *New London magazine*, December, 1785, p. 380. A review of *Omai* appears in the *Universal magazine*, December, 1785, pp. 332-34. This consists of a detailed summary, which is interesting only for the light it throws on the minutiae of plot and the use of mechanical stage devices.

⁴⁴ James Boaden, *Memoirs of the life of John Philip Kemble* (London, 1825), I, 311-12.

⁴⁵ O'Keeffe, *Recollections*, II, 110-11.

⁴⁶ L. B. Campbell, *A history of costuming on the English stage* ("University of Wisconsin studies in language and literature," No. 2), p. 211.

BOOK REVIEWS

Four Icelandic sagas. Translated with an introduction and notes by GWYN JONES. Princeton: Princeton University Press; New York: American-Scandinavian Foundation, 1935. Pp. 163.

The four sagas here chosen for English rendition are well worth the effort made, both for their intrinsic worth and for their difficulty of access. Two of them, *Thorstein the White's saga* and *The saga of the Men of Keelness*, have never appeared in English, while the others, *Hrafnkel Freysgodi's saga* and *The Weaponfirthers' saga*, are found only in rare editions. The present translation may be heartily recommended to the attention of students of medieval life and literature, as well as to anyone else interested in a good story out of the past.

Since the sagas were first rediscovered there have been sharp differences of opinion on how they should be translated into the modern languages. The present translator declares: "I have avoided on the one hand prosiness and a latinized vocabulary, and on the other that extraordinarily 'precious' language of the full-blooded school that itself seems sometimes to need translation." The adherents of the "full-blooded" or Morris school are fortunately few today, although the recent translation of *Egil's saga* by E. R. Eddison (Cambridge, 1930) shows that they are still with us. We may be grateful that Mr. Jones does not share this romantically minded English gentleman's hazy conception of the saga style. He has clearly realized that "more than those of any other ancient literature the men and women of the sagas are like people we know"; and that it is the saga translator's business to bring out this kinship by using a plain, straightforward style without frills and furbelows. He has no forsooths and prithees, and has not been deceived by the English associations which cling to the etymological equivalents of Old Norse words. The result is a competent translation and not a mere pastiche; it reflects life as it was lived in saga times in Iceland.

Yet we cannot call this version a distinguished one; it fails to achieve the perfect economy of oral narrative. The sagas are fundamentally not "literary," i.e. crabbed; in sentence structure and choice of words they reflect the spoken language—not the casual speech of any one individual, but the best and most effective utterance within the frame of the popular idiom, as selected and arranged by generations of skilled narrators. Concretely, we observe as a result of this polishing process an easy, natural rhythm, accommodated to the breath pauses of speech, easy to recite and remember. Similarly, the words and phrases are living expressions from the daily language of the narrators

and their audience. It may not be easy to transfer these qualities into English, in an age when the various styles and levels of speech are far more specialized than in the fourteenth century. Yet in rhythm and in idiom the present translation falls considerably short of what has been achieved, e.g., in Stella Mills's version of *Hrólfr Kraki's saga* (Oxford, 1934). The following passages will illustrate in concentrated form the faults which mar its excellence more often than they should:

Sam carried on the case in court until Hrafnkel was called on for the defence, unless that man were there present who wished to bring forward a defence in law. The applause was great at Sam's case, and it was a question whether any one would wish to bring forward a legal defence for Hrafnkel [p. 50].

"I ought to do as you wish," said Bui, "but it will seem hard to my foster-mother to fend for more like myself, and it is not easy to see, although Thorstein and I come together, which shall escape, even though I have to do with some odds" [p. 107].

We note here the following faults: (1) un-English word order, which rather frequently appears as unnecessary inversion of verb and subject, or misplacement of adverbs and modifiers; (2) clauses joined in puzzling ways, as when the "buts," the "thoughts," and the "wheres" of the original have not been altered to English equivalents; (3) awkward and undistinguished phrasing, e.g., "He is worth such that revenge might well be on him" (p. 57); (4) unidiomatic expressions, as when the words "come," "go," and "stand" appear with their Scandinavian values instead of the English.

The technical terms of legal processes, of agriculture, and of government cause a certain difficulty, and one must grant the translator the use of certain words like "godord" and "self-doom," which are carefully explained either in his excellent introduction or in the notes. But there seems much less call for words like "dale" (38), "landloper" (44), "lout" (51), "fell" (*passim*), "garth" (*passim*), "chattels" (60), "daymeal" (69), "kin-hurt" (76), "bondi" (80), "sax" (86), "forest-man" (51), most of which could easily have been given more perspicuous equivalents in modern English.

Occasionally the translator seems to have misunderstood the original, as when he renders *eyrr* (a river-mouth) by "tongue of land" (40). The following cases are significant: "... a booth . . . near where the Eastfirthers are accustomed to pitch" (45) should be "far from where" (*hvergi nær*); "Thorkel would like you to let him know before the judges fare out" (49) should be "wishes you to visit him . . ." (*vitið* from *vitja*, not *vita*); "All is right enough if only you are, and when the beast is not on the rope it is well, whatever becomes of us" (58) should read "If you are saved, all is well, for then his prey has avoided the trap, and he won't care what happens to the rest of us."

EINAR HAUGEN

University of Wisconsin

L'œuvre de Jean Renart. By R. LEJEUNE-DEHOUSSE. ("Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège," Fasc. LXI.) Paris: E. Droz, 1935. Pp. 470.

Jean Renart and his writings. By P. H. BEEKMAN. Paris: E. Droz, 1935. Pp. 147.

With Jean Renart now firmly established as one of the major writers of medieval France, it was time that there should be devoted to him a work of integration which would assemble, evaluate, and attempt to supplement where possible the scattered facts that have been brought out concerning him. Mme Lejeune-Dehousse understood well the nature of the work required and set about supplying it with thorough and intelligent scholarship. Her monograph is more than a mere synthesis, however, and must be considered, I believe, one of the most noteworthy contributions to the study of Old French literature published in recent years; it will be indispensable not only to the student of Jean Renart but to whoever would attain more than a superficial knowledge of Old French thought and letters. Space does not permit an enumeration here of all the interesting discoveries and ideas of Mme Lejeune-Dehousse. Among her contributions may be mentioned her development of the possibility that the personality of the emperor Corras in *Guillaume de Dole* was sketched in antithesis to that of Philip-Augustus; her narrowing down of the period in which *Guillaume de Dole* could have been composed to 1212-13; and her establishment of the dependence of *Galeran de Bretagne* on the *Escoufle*. Although she is on the whole most judicious in her procedure and her assertions generally seem well founded, occasionally Mme Lejeune-Dehousse ventures on uncertain ground and offers debatable conclusions. The *Lai de l'ombre*, for instance, cannot be dated with as much precision as she supposes—a circumstance which renders extremely hazardous her assumption that Renart accompanied Milon de Nanteuil to the Holy Land. Again, there is no reason to suppose, as she gratuitously does, that Renart was a young man when he wrote the *Escoufle*. His language seems to me to indicate that the poet was of an earlier generation than that to which Mme Lejeune-Dehousse would assign him (see *Modern philology*, XXXII, 350); in any case, we have no indication that his life extended beyond the first quarter of the thirteenth century. False assumptions make the treatment of the themes and sources of *Guillaume de Dole* of little value.

A real service is performed in the publication in an appendix of the two satirical pieces believed to concern Renart, *Du Plait Renart de Dammartin contre Vairon* and *De Renart et de Piaudoue*. These are accompanied by a very commendable study in which the author develops with some plausibility the rather startling theory that Renart himself wrote the two pieces. The word *vielle* in verse 72 of the *Plait* does not mean a musical instrument, as Mme Lejeune-Dehousse supposes, but 'old woman.' Her proposed correction and

citations from the *Roman de la Rose* and Villon are, therefore, *hors de propos*. The allusion is to the proverb "Qui mieulz ne puet, a sa vieille se dort" (Morawski, no. 1995), the sense of which is "One must get along with what he has." In the edition of *De Renart et de Piaudoue* the text is based on MS Paris, B.N. f. fr. 837 (A). Mme Lejeune-Dehousse, however, has too little confidence in her base manuscript; many of the readings she rejects can be defended. In VI, 11, the reading *sa mere*, rejected for *ta mere*, should certainly be retained. XXV, 1, should read *ne sai* instead of *ne s'ai*. *Se l'acort* instead of *Se la cort* would probably be a better reading in XXVIII, 4.

To Mme Lejeune-Dehousse's bibliography should be added A. H. Todd, "Guillaume de Dole: an unpublished Old French romance," *PMLA*, II (1886), 107-57; R. Levy, "Jehan Renart, *Lai de l'ombre*," *Romania*, LVIII (1932), 436-41; and my own two articles, "Jean Renart and the authorship of *Galeran de Bretagne*," *Modern language notes*, XLIX (1934), 248-55, and "New studies on Jean Renart," *Modern philology*, XXXII (1935), 343-52.

Far from attaining the value of Mme Lejeune-Dehousse's work, Miss Beekman's book is quite worthless. It contributes nothing and abounds in errors and absurdities. The author simply lacked competence to treat the subject and has no comprehension of the matters involved. Even when she attempts to present the views of others, the result is almost invariably a hopeless garbling. Some notion of her inconsequence and lack of method may be gained from the circumstance that although she records herself as being of the opinion that Renart did not write *Galeran de Bretagne*, she persistently cites passages from this romance as illustrations of his style and ideas!

I may perform an act of justice here by revealing information come to me by way of private correspondence. In her introduction Miss Beekman makes an acknowledgment for "valuable notes and corrections" from Professor J. L. Gerig. Since there is hardly a page in Miss Beekman's book which does not stand sorely in need of corrections, one may wonder at the nature of those Professor Gerig is supposed to have given. As a matter of fact, it appears that Miss Beekman ignored Professor Gerig's suggestions, and her use of his name is entirely unlicensed. It is regrettable that the name of so reputable a scholar should have been associated with so sorry a performance.

V. FREDERIC KOENIG

University of Arizona

Neoplatonism of the Italian Renaissance. By NESCA A. ROBB. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1935. Pp. 315.

Dr. Robb has presented in historical form an account of Italian neo-Platonism in the period of its efflorescence—from the days of Petrarch to the middle of the sixteenth century. She gives substance to her theme through the analysis of important works of the movement, with general estimates

of their authors. The preponderantly philosophic portion of the book is comprised in the chapters: "Petrarch," "Petrarch to Ficino," "Marsilio Ficino and the Platonic Academy," "The Medici circle," and "The 'Trattati d'amore,'" followed by a chapter on "Neoplatonism and the arts," which in turn introduces "The lyric: Michelangelo." In the conclusion the author takes occasion to compare the principles and spirit of neo-Platonism, in its emergence against Scholasticism, with those of Romanticism in a later age. A selective bibliography and index close the volume.

Any student of neo-Platonism is soon put to it to find a definition which shall exclude on the one hand that Petrarchism which derives from the *dolce stil nuovo* and on the other the habit of thought whose source lies in the immediate study of Plato's own text. To be sure, any individual work may not fit clearly into a single one of these similar but distinct categories, and to assign it or a portion of it a Platonistic, neo-Platonistic, or Petrarchistic label may do it injustice; but such a clarification of principle helps to throw light on Renaissance literary practice. Dr. Robb, for instance, if she had been concerned with keeping clear the distinction between Petrarchism and either Platonism or neo-Platonism, would have been struck by the fact that the Petrarchistic lover (as descendant of the feudal vassal-poet) always deems himself below the object of his passion, and lives in sorrow, while lover and beloved in the Greek tradition progress happily side by side to the contemplation of that celestial Beauty which each sees shadowed forth in the person of the other. Furthermore, it is not by chance that Bembo in the third book of the *Asolani* and Castiglione in the fourth of the *Cortegiano* show a more developed aesthetic tone than do most other writers of *trattati d'amore*; they are at just these points inspired much more by the brilliant poetry of Plato's *Symposium* than by the pedestrian elaboration of Ficino's *Convito* or other neo-Platonistic sources. To realize this is to realize the more keenly the great charm exerted by Plato's own style upon sensitive artists.

The mass of important material organized by Dr. Robb in her early chapters will be of great service to inquirers in the field, even though she has had to leave unmentioned many works which well illustrate the diffusion of philosophic thought into current literature—and even though one may wish that her bibliography had been intended to show the present state of knowledge in the field. It is not her fault if in these chapters her subject matter commands her style and offers but slow reading. Her practice of adding quotation to paraphrase is immensely helpful, although her translation of Latin or Italian into her own English verse occasionally obscures rather than clarifies the thought of her originals.

The chapter on the "Trattato d'amore" is an illuminating and orderly presentation of a minor genre important in Italian Renaissance literature, with the habitual illustrative passages; but that on "Neoplatonism and the arts" draws quite clearly upon Dr. Robb's immediate and vigorous response to

the beauties of Italian painting and sculpture. Although documents or works which illustrate neo-Platonism in the arts are none too frequent and are at best subject to varying personal interpretation, the author by avoiding too general claims encourages agreement with her conclusions. Her treatment of Michelangelo's lyric in the following chapter is an admirable exposition of the influence exerted upon a great artist by a great philosophical concept emotionally embraced. How far he stands, despite his gnarled and writhen verse-forms, above the facile Petrarchistic sonneteers who crowd the foreground of Italian lyric in his day!

The notes to the work, though ample and useful, seem to have been rather an afterthought; the Latin and Italian passages there are not translated, as are some of no greater importance in the body of the page; and an appalling array of misprints remains to disquiet the reader of what is after all a valuable aid to the student of Renaissance literature and should not be forced to apology for its form.

ROBERT V. MERRILL

University of Chicago

The works of Edmund Spenser: a variorum edition. Edited by EDWIN GREENLAW, CHARLES GROSVENOR OSGOOD, and FREDERICK MORGAN PADELFORD. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. Vol. I: *The faerie queene, Book One*. Ed. by F. M. PADELFORD, 1932. Pp. xii+566. Vol. II: *The faerie queene, Book Two*. Ed. by EDWIN GREENLAW, C. G. OSGOOD, and F. M. PADELFORD, assisted by RAY HEFFNER, JAMES G. McMANAWAY, and ERNEST STRATHMANN, 1933. Pp. xii+517. Vol. III: *The faerie queene, Book Three*. Ed. by F. M. PADELFORD, 1934. Pp. x+452.

The publication of these three volumes marks the completion of Part I of *The faerie queene*, the first large unit of the projected Variorum edition of the whole works of Spenser, designed originally by Professors Carpenter and Greenlaw as early as 1922, then taken over by Greenlaw as chief editor, with the able co-operation of Professors Osgood and Padelford as joint editors and with assistance by several members of the Johns Hopkins staff; the associate editors carrying on the work since the death of Professor Greenlaw with the aid of various other American scholars.

These handsome volumes, excellently composed in good clear type on firm but light paper, and well bound, will appeal to book lovers in general as well as to those interested in research on Spenser. Special students of Spenser owe a large debt of gratitude to the editorial staff for the erudition and long years of patient work which have provided a better text than was hitherto available, together with a massive accumulation of commentary and criticism, quoted or summarized.

The text is based chiefly upon the 1596, or second, version of this first part, with variant readings and critical notes in a textual appendix in each volume.

The editing of the text seems to have been carefully done. As considerable use is made of readings from J. C. Smith's critical text of 1909, there might have been a more complete checking of the Oxford Standard Authors text (1912, 1924), in which Smith corrects typographical errors of 1909. This would have eliminated a few useless speculations, as in the first, third, and fourth critical notes on Book II, canto vii (II, 510).

The general plan is the same in the three volumes, though proportions vary. The text is in each volume followed by an elaborate textual commentary, consisting of explanatory notes by scholars old and modern, occasionally capped by editorial comment, and of short bits of literary criticism. Fuller discussion of problems of interpretation and more extensive criticism of literary technique are reserved for topical appendixes, of which there are nine in the first volume, eleven in the second, and nine in the third, the subjects ranging from interpretation of a single stanza to the major problems of Spenser's purpose, meaning, sources, and literary methods.

The textual commentaries are rich in interest to the careful student of Spenser. They are perhaps too full—not so often through inclusion of notes on points not requiring annotation as through cumulation of repetitive explanation resulting from adherence to the usual Variorum ideal, and occasionally through admission of a kind of purring literary appreciation that is commonplace rather than penetrative or illuminating ("these are fine lines"; "a beautiful picture"; "perhaps the best-known and most beautiful passage," etc.). The editors are not, of course, to blame for the fact that the scholarly elucidation of Spenser, on the whole, excels in quality most of the aesthetic criticism from which they had to choose. The repetitive comments quoted should at least serve to warn writers against future rediscoveries of old stuff. The inclusion of many mistaken explanations could prove a pitfall to the unwary (as in any Variorum); but the inclusion of the errors and curiosities of scholarship and criticism along with the sound interpretation enables the intelligent reader to trace the tendencies of Spenserian scholarship and general critical ideals from age to age, as do also the appendixes (particularly of Book I) on a larger scale.

The reader attempting to use the very valuable notes and abstracts as a basis for further study and research experiences certain difficulties arising from the distribution of materials among the three textual commentaries and the twenty-nine appendixes (which necessarily overlap at many points), because no topical index is as yet provided, and the cross-references (especially in Volume II) are quite inadequate as a substitute. The idea of making the bibliography cumulative, and of omitting from the headings of the abstracts in the appendixes the dates and places of publication of the books and articles digested was unhappy. The issuing of an exhaustive analytical index at the end of the series, together with a complete bibliography (with fuller entries than some of those included in the partial lists), preferably in such shape that

offprints could be made for separate sale, would make the individual volumes far more serviceable. A few illustrations of the present difficulties will suffice. For Spenser's debt to Ariosto, one must consult in Volume I, Appendix I ("Plan and conduct"), Appendix III ("Spenser and Ariosto as artists"), Appendix IV ("Sources"), and then extend the search to other volumes. In Volume II, Appendix V is on "Spenser and Milton," and contains abstracts from Greenlaw's article, "A better teacher than Aquinas," but does not quote or refer to his "Spenser's influence on *Paradise lost*," an article not included in the bibliography of this volume, but in that of Volume III. On Temperance in Book II appear abstracts from articles of Padelford and Viola Hulbert, but one misses here and in the bibliography of Volume II reference to important dissertations by De Moss and Mrs. Hulbert (which are represented in Volume I). Virgil's influence on Spenser is similarly split between two volumes, without cross-reference, as is also Greenlaw's comprehensive attack on unravelers of historical allegory. Some of the cross-references which are provided act like will-o'-the-wisps. In Volume II, page 190, "See Appendices, 'The historical allegory,' 'Burton on Spenser,' 'Spenser's use of Ariosto for allegory'" is a poor guide. The first reference is to the true title of an appendix in each volume. Contents and bibliography of Volume II afford no clue to the identity of "Burton on Spenser," which is the title of one article, by Merritt Hughes, summarized as the second abstract in the appendix entitled "Elizabethan psychology," in Volume II, but entered under the author's name only in the bibliography of Volume I. Similarly, "Spenser's use of Ariosto for allegory" is the title not of any appendix, but of an article, to be located by looking in Appendix VII of Volume II, under "Sources," then under "Italian romances," then under "Ariosto"; and again one must turn for the bibliographical entry to Volume I.

On source studies, a commendable innovation appears in Volume III, Appendix IX, which contains a classified list of main sources and analogues for Book III. It is to be hoped that eventually the whole debt of Spenser to his chief sources will be comprehensively discussed by scholars. Good headway has been made in studies of the debt to the Bible, to myths and fables, to legends and chronicle history, to moralities, to English and foreign medieval romances, and to many of the early Renaissance prose writers and poets of Italy, notably Ariosto, Tasso, Dante, and Petrarch. The influence of Virgil and that of Ovid have received considerable attention, but Homer and the Greek lyric poets have been less considered. There has been enough discussion of Aristotle to enable the critical reader to draw intelligent conclusions as to the degree and nature of his influence, and its modification by the work of commentators, translators, and adapters in the Christian Era. Except as to the Hymns, the influence of Plato has been less definitely and comprehensively treated, possibly because neo-Platonic idealism is but vaguely understood by many writers on Spenser. The strange hash made of the ab-

stract from Harrison on Spenser's Platonism (II, 416) is due to dislocation of lines and possibly some accidental omission. Recent skepticism as to whether Spenser could or did read Greek works in the original seems ill founded, in view of the Cambridge curriculum, the close association with Harvey, who discussed the classics with Spenser, the poet's own frequent references to the Greeks and his use of Greek themes and materials, as well as his expressed desire to teach Greek to Bryskett while in Ireland, presumably for the pleasure of discussing with a congenial spirit Greek philosophy and literature. Both more scholarship and a more patient and tolerant attitude toward an occasional slip are needed for a satisfying treatment of Spenser's whole debt to the Greeks. It may be said of the digests of source studies in the *Variorum* that most of them outside the realm of philosophy should be clear to the general reader.

The special appendixes on the plan and conduct of the narrative and those on other points of literary technique are also simple enough to be understood with ease. And among the various views of the moral and spiritual allegory are several broad and yet illuminating interpretations, from which most readers will be able to choose something that satisfies. On the more controversial articles dealing with special problems, the abstracts usually summarize the authors' positions without appearance of intentional editorial bias, though the representations vary greatly in proportion.

The great arena of conflicting views is the interpretation of the historical allegory of *The faerie queene*. The chief editors of Books I and II were here obviously at odds as to aims, ideals, and methods of approach. From Dryden's assertion that "the original of every knight was then living in the court of Elizabeth," on through the remarks of Upton, Scott, Frank Howard, and others, to the more modern studies beginning with J. E. Whitney's interpretation (Grosart's edition of the *Works* [1888]), Padelford has marshaled in order the various attempts to trace Spenser's treatment, in Book I, of themes, problems, characters, and situations in the history of church and state. Though disagreeing in many details, the expositions of Padelford (1911—) and Miss Winstanley (1914—) are at one in their aim to show a more or less sustained religious and political allegory based on actual situations and involving real persons, mostly prior to the accession of Elizabeth—an event which, according to Miss Winstanley, should appear in the narrative coincidently with the betrothal of Una to the Redcross Knight, which is followed by her coronation (I, xii, 8). She interprets Duessa as False Faith, hence Catholicism, and, more specifically, as (1) Mary Tudor and (2), near the end of the book, Mary, Queen of Scots—both Catholics and both rivals and foes of Elizabeth—an explanation which reconciles some seeming inconsistencies in aspects and behavior of the figure Duessa in Book I, and also permits one to place the bloody martyrdom of Christian saints (I, viii, 35–36) in the reign of "Bloody Mary." She sketches in numerous other figures prominent in church and state, with some good

evidence, and some that is too slight. The most essential difference in Padel-ford's position is that he confines his references more specifically to the struggles of the Reformation in the reign of Henry VIII, though he differs also in his attitude toward the identification of individual figures.

To these views, which are harmonious in general method of approach, though differing in several conclusions, Greenlaw opposes certain views developed by himself and his student and assistant, Ray Heffner. In general, he condemns the historical method of approach to the interpretation of the allegory; and, in particular, he disparages the effort to trace references to actual historical situations prior to the accession of Elizabeth as constituting a story of the struggles of the Reformation, as well as the attempts to identify individual persons as shadowed in the allegory, save as "illustration, or compliment, or ornament" (I, 494). The virtues in *The faerie queene* should, according to him (I, 495, and II, 404), be conceived not in the light of Aristotelian ethics, but as political virtues which seemed to Spenser and his contemporaries "incarnate in their Queen." Not only Temperance in Book II, but Holiness in Book I is to be considered as a politic virtue of the governor.

A difficulty might arise if Greenlaw's conception were overstressed. For Spenser says he has endeavored "to pourtraict in Arthure, before he was king, the image of a brave knight, perfected in the twelve *private morall* virtues, as Aristotle hath deuised, the which is the purpose of these first twelue bookes; which if I finde to be well accepted, I may be perhaps encouraged, to frame the *other part of politicke vertues in his person, after that hee came to be king*" [italics mine]. Moreover, in the final stanza of the poem to Book V, after paying tribute to Elizabeth's praised justice, he adds, "The instrument whereof, loe here thy Artegall," and proceeds at once to Artegall's training and career. None can doubt that the major theme of Book V is, specifically, the career and policy of Lord Grey de Wilton in Ireland. And in the one book which definitely assigns its virtue to the Queen (Book III, on Chastity), Spenser carefully notes at the end of the poem that he here treats her in her private character. Surely the poet is entitled to be heard as to what he tried to do, however one may think he ought to have conceived and presented these virtues.

The researches of Charles B. Millican (see I, 482; cf. John Hughes, I, 317) and of Greenlaw (I, 485-90, 493) set forth a strong claim for consideration of what is not a new idea, but before, no doubt, underrated—that Spenser in his praise of Elizabeth as sovereign celebrates her as representing the Tudor dynasty, with its traditional claims of Arthurian descent, with all that implies of imperial ideals for the extension of England's powers; and that he treats Elizabeth as a symbol of Arthur reigning again and bringing back to England the ideal justice and splendor of a Golden Age, after the long vicissitudes preceding the establishment of the Tudor dynasty. The Arthur of *The faerie queene* cannot, of course, be adequately explained by the Arthur of the romances—still less by the abortive (and to us now ludicrous) effort of Spenser

to associate this character in the narrative with the "worthy whome she loved best" (see *Calender*, October), an association obviously unfit unless perhaps in the brief episode in Book V concerning Leicester's services in extending England's influence in the Netherlands, which seemed to Spenser worthy of being set beside Grey's exploits in Ireland as typifying ideal justice. The Arthurian return motive, however, is chiefly valuable for the interpretation of a portion of Book III—a book in which the problem surrounding Duessa is conspicuously absent. It could be accepted as supplementing without displacing the attempts of the decipherers of the historical allegory to elucidate the many situations in the story left untouched by the expositions of Greenlaw and Heffner.

But there is a definite and important clash of views of the editors as to whether the story of Book I concerns matters prior to Elizabeth's accession, as to whether there is any sustained allegory, and as to whether individual figures should be identified. Greenlaw proposes to substitute for historical interpretation of the meaning a conception of the whole poem as a eulogy on Elizabeth's virtues as ruler, and to explain these virtues almost exclusively by comparison with contemporary and recent compliments to the Queen, in coronation and anniversary masques, pageants, and eulogistic poems within her reign—an idea carried into more detail by Mr. Heffner.

It may readily be admitted that portions of *The faerie queene* are masque-like, with characters which are obvious symbols of abstract ideas, such as Envy, Rumor, Discord. But it is hardly to be hoped that coronation masques and pageants and conventional complimentary poems on Elizabeth will unlock any great mysteries as to the final meaning of others than the masque-like sections with their personified abstractions. The purpose, scope, and technique of the masque necessarily differ from those of a long allegorical "epic." The symbolism of the occasional shows is of the simplest—one might say, the shallowest—nature, the pictorial suggestion of over-obvious commonplaces expressed in general terms. As was remarked at the St. George device for James's entry to London, March 15, 1604, "The multitude is now to be our audience, whose heads will miserably run a wooll-gathering, if we doo but offer to breake them with hard words." Spenser's allegory is no hastily assembled show for a miscellaneous crowd to gape at on a single occasion, but a painfully worked out two-volume book occupying him probably a part of the time for about fourteen years, and intended for statesmen, courtiers, scholars, and men of letters to ponder over and re-read. It is a winding, complicated, subtle, and, if we may believe the author, a three-layered allegory, at least in parts.

Greenlaw poses the question: "What did the Elizabethans understand by allegory? What was the practice of Spenser himself? Were Spenser and Shakespeare really not poets so much as exponents of a cipher system?" It might be answered that then, as now, allegorical works could be variously en-

joyed, according to the mental age, intelligence, information, and interests of the reader. Sir John Harington, translator of the model which Spenser hoped to "overgo" in *The faerie queene*, and one of the earliest to comment on Spenser's poem, remarked of allegorical poetry: "Poetry is one kind of meat to feed divers tastes. For the weaker capacities will feed themselves with the pleasantness of the history and the sweetness of the verse; some that have stronger stomachs will, as it were, take a further taste of the moral sense; and a third sort, more high conceited than they, will digest the allegory." In all these ways *The faerie queene* has been enjoyed by different people, and probably it will continue to be. Spenser, at least, believed that, in addition to the pictures and the story and the compliments and general ideas, he was offering some nuts which the general public as a whole might fail to crack. He disclaims the more obvious symbolism as his ultimate purpose, apologizing to Raleigh for departing from the method of "good discipline delivered plainly by way of precepts, or sermoned at large, as they use"; for presenting his ideas "clowdily enwrapped"; and refers to a "continued Allegory, or darke conceit"; indicating also that figures in his story, besides representing general ideas, may refer to particular individuals, and that these individuals may be divided into aspects or parts figured separately as characters. Several dedicatory poems seem to say that the patrons or their families are somehow celebrated in the poem. And Burghley, that astute decipherer of literary cryptograms, is assured that he will find it worth his while to penetrate the "dim vele" with which "from comune vew / Their fairer parts are hid," and get their "deeper sence." All this air of mystery on Spenser's part would be rather childish if the "key" were in the coronation pageants—somewhat like locking up a house with a great show of secrecy and going off leaving the key sticking in the front door.

It is, of course, desirable to examine the masques, pageants, and complimentary poems, and get all the light they can throw upon Spenser's ideas. But when we see what the pageants yield up to Mr. Heffner by way of interpretation, it is pretty much what one might expect—commonplace, general ideas, already known and accepted by the average intelligent reader of Spenser: that Una is Truth, that religion is the main subject of Book I, that Elizabeth is figured as the champion of true religion, that she made it one of her first concerns after her coronation, that to be the champion of true religion was by contemporaries considered a virtue, that contemporaries interpreted Book I as concerning Elizabeth and pure religion (I, 482). All this could perfectly well be granted by anyone who believed in either Greenlaw's point of view or Padelford's.

The real clash is not with reference to such ideas, but with regard to the question whether Spenser did or did not loop back from Elizabeth's accession and devote a large part of Book I to an elaborate prefatory survey of the state of the realm before her accession, with special reference to the conflict of the

Reformation movement with Catholicism and to particular persons and events concerned in that struggle.

For showing that there is little or no matter in Book I concerning the period before Elizabeth's accession, many of Heffner's examples from contemporary literature are unhappily chosen. The handling of the St. George material here is perhaps the least satisfactory. For there was a coronation pageant also for Edward VI, combining matters very much as in Book I, showing St. George in armor on horseback, with an armed page, and "a faire Maiden holding a Lamb in a string." Selden was not guilty of implying that Spenser was the first to make St. George an emblem of religion (I, 477). We may hope that he knew that Lydgate in a "tapestry poem" had made St. George protector and patron of Englishmen in peace and war, and also a representative of "holiness," of knighthood and renown, and "Crystes own knight." As refuting the idea of individual reference in Spenser's characters, Vennard's "Saint George for England" (*The right way to Heaven* [1601]) must be disregarded, as it culminates with the point that Mountjoy is to act as St. George in service in Ireland against a satanic antagonist, the "diuellish proud Tirone"—which speaks rather for the methods of interpretation employed by Gough, Padelford, and Winstanley. The date 1603 for Lady Diana Primrose's *A chaine of pearle* (*Var.*, I, 475 and the original article) must be from an explanatory note at the end, "**Elisabetha fuit Terrae Regina Marisque. Primo Jacobi*," as the poem was entered for publication in January, 1630. In any case it has little bearing on Spenser's plan for the first book so long before. Peele's Farewell to Drake and Norris (*ca.* April, 1589) serves as an analogue, but can hardly be said to "anticipate" Spenser's treatment of St. George and Protestantism in Book I. Peele skims Elizabeth's girlhood, and pictures Envy as vanquished in that period, not after her accession (*cf.* *FQ*, I, iv). The quotation from Niccols' *England's Eliza* (1610) is so cut that it does not appear that seven stanzas summarize matters antedating the accession; but stanzas 1-3, quoted on page 478, review Edward's death, and Mary's reign, period of "bloodie Error's rage"—precisely the construction put upon the bloody martyrdoms in Book I by Winstanley and Padelford. Also, stanza 1 locates in Mary's reign the search for "Time's fair Fidessa." Dekker's *Whore of Babylon* (1607) clearly places its dumb show of Truth and Time before the entry of the Fairy Queen. Dekker's remark on the difference between a poet's and a historiographer's method undoubtedly echoes Spenser's letter to Raleigh:

For the Methode of a Poet historical is not such, as of an Historiographer. For an Historiographer discourseth of afayres orderly as they wer donne, accounting as well the times as the actions, but a Poet thrusteth into the middest, euen where it most concerneth him, and there recouring to the thinges forepaste, and diuining of thinges to come, maketh a pleasing Analysis of all.

In the account of the scheme of the book which follows, we see that in fact

the troubles of Una have preceded the entrance of St. George as Elizabeth's champion, but he is presented first, for convenience, as ready and waiting for a quest. This statement of method by Spenser should prepare us for the "looping back" which seems to be habitual with him. It would serve to rationalize beginning in the midst, with the Queen whose praises run through the whole work, and yet launching into an elaborate preface on the condition of the realm before her accession, so as to create a striking contrast between a preceding dark age and her glorious reign, thus magnifying her accomplishments. As most of the poems cited by Heffner have similar, though, of course, briefer, prefaces summarizing pre-Elizabethan times, the argument from these examples that Spenser did not indulge in such a preliminary survey seems to fall down.

Mr. Heffner's final word is, that we should look to the life and reign of Elizabeth for the events allegorically set forth in Book I. And Greenlaw and Heffner both conclude that the purpose of the whole poem is to praise Elizabeth for her politic virtues as displayed exclusively within her reign.

Book I construed as dealing solely with the reign and virtues of Elizabeth offers a strange line of praise. As champion of religion from the beginning of the book, she would step off at once to ignominious defeat by Foul Error (Canto I). Not until Canto VIII is that dragon conquered, or the true hideousness of Duessa revealed; not until Canto X, stanza 61, is the Redcross Knight to be called St. George and patron saint of England; not until Canto XII is Una betrothed to him and formally crowned in semblance of "a goodly maiden Queene." Could Spenser picture thus the Golden Age inaugurated by Elizabeth? It is the tale of a dark age of superstition, of ignorance and doctrinal error, of envy, of hypocrisy and treachery long triumphant, of sinful pride and bloody violence of the mighty; an age when church robbery flourished, proud palaces rested on dunghills of dead bones and rotten corpses; when the floors swam with the blood of innocent children and altars dripped with the blood of persecuted Christian martyrs, when a creature resembling the scarlet whore of Revelations flourished—in short, till near the end of the book, an age of religious despair and defeat! If this is Elizabeth's religious rule, what sort of praise-offering have we for a poem dedicated to a magnificent empress, "renowned for pietie, vertue, and all gracious gouernment . . . , defender of the faith"?

Perhaps the emphasis on the reign of Henry VIII is too strong in Padelford's interpretation. Some of Miss Winstanley's individual identifications invite challenge. But, on the other hand, there is abundance of material not touched or impossible to explain by the proposed substitutes; so that the individual reader of Volume I will be obliged to make his own choices after a careful study of the conflicting lines of evidence as presented in the Variorum and the books and articles which it summarizes. A final position has not been reached.

Book II Greenlaw proposes to approach not by discussion of Aristotelian aspects of the philosophy but in the light of contemporary literature, chiefly a projected political masque and a short poem by Elizabeth. The masque was designed for the occasion of a projected meeting of Mary Queen of Scots with Elizabeth in 1562, but was abandoned because there was no such meeting. The maidens Temperance and Prudence in this masque resemble Guyon and the Palmer in Book II, according to Mr. Greenlaw (II, 405). On the first night they were to condemn to prison False Rumor and Discord, with Argus as jailer; and on the second night they were to be portrayed as necessarily allying themselves with eternal Peace and Amity, to bring about victory and prosperity; the whole to conclude in a dance of English men with Scottish ladies. Clearly, there is correspondence in the personification of abstract ideas such as Prudence and Temperance. But this is rather commonplace; and Spenser certainly reverses Burghley's idea that a prudent and temperate Queen of England could and must ally herself in perpetual peace and amity with the Queen of Scots. Spenser's treatment aligns itself much more closely with Greenlaw's other example from contemporary literature, the "ditty" composed by Elizabeth on the dominance of Falsehood in her realms because of the dangerous factions fomented by the Queen of Scots, a condition which could not exist "if Reason rul'd, or Wisdom weav'd the webb." The daughter of Debate, who sows Discord, shall reap no gain where "still peace" has been taught to grow.

In spite of his wholesale condemnation of decipherers who trace historical situations underlying the story of the allegory, Greenlaw definitely accepts (II, 408) Miss Winstanley's identification of Acrasia as Mary, Queen of Scots (cf. also II, 404, Winstanley, and 402, Buck). If this construction is acceptable, we should note that it gives point to a considerable part of the story, as the Palmer (Prudence?) complained to Elizabeth (II, ii, 43) of the "grievous mischiefes" wrought by Acrasia, and "crau'd redresse," whereupon the gracious and merciful Queen "eftsoones deuised redresse for such annoyas," and assigned the mission at once to Guyon. The result of that mission appears in II, ix, 9, where Guyon (Temperance) showed the whole story "of false Acrasia, and her wicked wiles, /Which to auenge, the Palmer him forth drew/From Faery court." The lesson to be drawn from the application of this political masque and the Queen's letter to the interpretation of Book II would seem to be that you can drive history out of *The faerie queene* with a pitchfork, but it comes back in at another door. History thoroughly studied and rightly interpreted offers more of value for the understanding of such sections of the narrative than does such a political masque as the one designed for the projected peace meeting. Its vague, broad symbolism and extreme elasticity of application are attested by the fact (which ought to be noted) that, though abandoned for the peace meeting with the Queen of Scots desired by Burghley, this masque was refurbished to serve for a meeting to celebrate

alliance in perpetual peace and amity with the King of France, on the occasion of the visit of the French ambassador, the Duc de Montmorency, June 9, 1572 (see Brotanek, Reyher, Feuillerat, Welsford, and Chambers [*Elizabethan stage*]). All such masques were subject to repetition, because they meant so little that is definite. *Astrea* serves for Elizabeth, and to flatter a mayor of London; St. George for Edward VI, Elizabeth, and James. These masques are symbolic, but not continued allegory. They touch only small parts of Spenser's story.

It is hard to understand why, if Greenlaw accepts the interpretation of Guyon's mission as having to do with the putting-down of Mary, Queen of Scots, and if he is himself interested in deciphering historical and political allegory in the *Arcadia*, and is content with his own unraveling of a political historical allegory in *Mother Hubberds tale* (where the careers and characters of Simier and Alençon, whether viewed singly or compositely, bristle with difficulties as figured under the Ape's adventures in an English setting under the dominance of Burghley as the Fox), he should be so extremely opposed to the continuance of efforts to trace history underlying other parts of *The faerie queene*.

It seems both unwise and unnecessary to tie up the whole six books of *The faerie queene* and condemn the whole method of historical approach to an understanding of the allegory. One who confines himself to purely poetic appreciation loses much of the point of Book V, which requires for any intelligent understanding some knowledge of the Irish situation, and has already been made much clearer by the research of Gough and others. Book III is, except for the Arthurian-return motive, far less dependent on a knowledge of history for its appreciation. Historical interpretations of other parts of this book are, so far, unsatisfactory. Like Book III, Book IV expounds its theme (Friendship) in such general terms that its poetic appeal will suffice for many readers, as an expression of the Renaissance ideal of that virtue. Even Book VI (though it certainly points to some reality in the person of Melibœ) is sufficiently interesting as an exposition of the Renaissance ideal of courtesy to permit one's mind to rest in that conception, if one refuses to decide whether Sidney is the personification of courtesy or, as some have thought, Essex, both of whom married Walsingham's daughter. Book II, as we have seen, must, even by Greenlaw's interpretation, have some historical reference to Mary, Queen of Scots and her claim to the throne of England; and it devotes the tenth canto to chronicle history. Book I will seem to many readers almost as dependent as Book V upon history for its interpretation; and the fact that it is as much church history as political history that must be drawn upon would not seem to be a valid reason for refusing such application, in view of the importance of Duessa in the whole story and the close alliance of religion and politics in England then, and the recognition from the time of Spenser to today that Duessa is the Catholic Queen of Scots, at least through a large

part of the story. The efforts of historical interpreters of Book I, as summarized in the *Variorum*, conflicting though they are in details, nevertheless do throw some light upon the essential nature and significance of Una, Duessa, the Redecross Knight, the House of Holiness, the Dragon of Error, the Giant Despair, Orgoglio, the killing of Kirkrapine, the martyrdom of Christian saints. Attempted interpretations of Arthur, of Sansloy, Sansfoy, Sansjoy, Satyrane, and Fradubio fall short of conviction. And the Lion, alas, is a desperate problem for the historical interpreters. He is Henry VIII to Upton, Winstanley, and others, is Cromwell to Padelford, Violence to Ruskin (in spite of his behaving as nicely as the Lion chaperon of the lady in old romances, on some occasions); he is the Law of Nature to Jones, the Counts of Toulouse to Keightley, the Emblem of the Netherlands to Howard. When his face looks through the mask, perhaps he will turn out to be only Snug the Joiner, or some such general conception as the power of royal fiat appertaining to the English king for the time being (somewhat as Talus seems to be the legal and military enforcing power of the English nation as a whole). This would at least permit him to die in Book I, canto ii, stanza 42 (just before proud *Lucifera* made herself a Queen without right [I, iv, 12; Mary Tudor?]), the sole sovereign power of an English queen being naturally forfeit through marriage with a King of Spain; and it would account for his bobbing up again in the story, as where he lies under the feet of *Mercilla* at Duessa's trial, the law taking its course instead of the royal lion's devouring the offender.

It may be conceded to Greenlaw's position that there is an ever present danger that historical interpreters of the allegory will be betrayed by a happy resemblance at one situation to push the analogy too far, continuing the construction beyond logical possibilities, to the warping of history and biography, and to the ignoring of the general principle that great poetic geniuses, even though writing allegory with definite individuals and events in mind, are unlikely to subordinate their poetic effects to the working-out of strictly factual reproductions of the whole careers, or even to exhaustive and impartial portrayal of all traits and aspects of the chosen figures. Spenser's letter to Raleigh is a helpful guide in its suggestion that he does not aim to transfer the whole of a character into his story and represent it by one and only one figure consistently and continuously. He analyzes traits, divides, and recombines, as do all creative artists. And, we may add, he has a strong tendency to exaggerate and idealize aspects, as of Leicester's justice in the Netherlands, and Grey's in Ireland. It is doubtful, however, whether the unreasonableness of some historical interpretations of allegory proposed is due, as Greenlaw suggests, to the possession of too great knowledge of secret history of the times. Is it not more likely that some, at least, of the "secret" references in Spenser's works were, like the now hidden allusions of many of the allegorical pastoral romances of that time, easy enough for Spenser's own circle to guess at, and that it is the rarity or absence of more intimate historical records that

keeps us in the dark? One great drawback in historical interpretation of allegory is, of course, a lack of common sense; but to common sense the possession of greater historical knowledge is not necessarily an inalienable foe.

University of Chicago

EVELYN MAY ALBRIGHT

Rebellious Fraser's, Nol Yorkes magazine in the days of Maginn, Thackeray and Carlyle. By MIRIAM M. H. THRALL. "Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature," No. 117.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1934. Pp. 332.

Victorian wallflowers. By MALCOLM ELWIN. London: Jonathan Cape, 1934. Pp. 324.

A century ago the "spirit of the age" was utilitarian and sentimental, the political movements either mildly revolutionary or advocating *laissez faire*; but the greatest periodical of the age, *Fraser's magazine*, vigorously opposed all of these "progressive" tendencies, won a commanding place in criticism, and nourished some of the greatest writers of the century. Its position is accurately defined by Miriam Thrall in *Rebellious Fraser's*:

Those who were most roughly treated at these moments of ruthless hilarity were naturally the political economists and the writers who tended toward materialism in religion and philosophy. The staff viewed with . . . alarm any increase in the influence of rationalistic science and theology.

It was wholesomely opposed to the long-winded didacticism of its day, and its own approach was rapid and informal. Its staff tolerated neither bombast nor the sentimentalism which was then in fashion.

Fraser's magazine was not doomed to feebleness and sterility. No periodical of the Victorian Age could boast solidier achievements, and not the least of these was its service in offering the proper "nursery-bed" for Carlyle and Thackeray, who owed more than has been generally recognized to their connection with *Fraser's*.

The slashing editor Maginn, the young student Carlyle, the dilettante Thackeray, the priest and Bohemian Prout, the anthropologist Croker, could scarcely have failed, however unconsciously, to urge one another on. Thus the magazine, boorish as it frequently was, came to look at the age with strangely disillusioned eyes, fashioning for its privileged staff an uncanny perspective and freedom, as if subsequent modes of thought and to some extent of style already lay open before them.

All of this is very true, and no previous study that I know of has recognized the importance of *Fraser's* in the literary history of the early Victorian Age.

In a thoroughly justifiable desire to emphasize an influence that has not before received sufficient recognition, the author does indeed go too far, in saying, for example, that "there is no passage of Thackeray's early work which

could not be attributed to Maginn." Nor is it just to say that "There is not a vestige . . . of human sympathy within the bestiality of *Catherine*," for there is at least one passage of Thackeray's warm sympathy. Moreover, she has sometimes confined her study too closely to the magazine. For example, she argues against Thackeray's authorship of a certain piece on the grounds that an attack on Byron and Moore would not be likely to come from his pen. "Although Thackeray in his acknowledged writings bears a manly part in various Fraserian frays, neither Byron nor Moore are among the objects of his attack." But as early as 1833 in his *National standard* he had attacked "the Satanico-Byronic heroes of the present school of romance," and "The professor," in *Bentley's miscellany* in 1837 satirized the Byronic romance. In *A journey from Cornhill to Grand Cairo* (1846) he passes a critical judgment that should be very well known: "Think of 'filling high a cup of Samian wine'; small beer is nectar compared to it, and Byron himself always drank gin. That man *never* wrote from his heart."

More regrettable than errors of detail is the bias that has been given to the presentation. The title, *Rebellious Fraser's*, is misleading—though it might have the advantage of winning for the volume more favorable attention from New York book-reviewers. It is not just—to call a Tory or a classicist a rebel merely because he is rebelling against the fashion of rebellion. Newman protested against Protestantism, but we would not call him the Protestant cardinal. *Fraser's* is presented as "one of the most important organs of progressive thought and open revolt in the Victorian age," though in the next statement we are told (correctly) that it opposed utilitarianism and laissez faire, which are more deserving of the designation "progressive thought" than are the productions of Thackeray or Carlyle, Maginn, and Prout. But, on the whole, this is an adequate record of the early years of the magazine, spiced with excellent quotations to give the flavor of that journalism at its liveliest.

Malcolm Elwin, in *Victorian wallflowers*, agrees in praising *Fraser's*: "Probably no magazine before or since employed a variety of talent so wide." This book is a "panoramic survey of popular Victorian literature," especially of the literary periodical, against which background the author has "planted nine central and representative figures—or 'wallflowers.'" It therefore embraces two purposes. . . . And the consequence is chaos. A chapter will begin in the middle of the author's life, in order to show his connection with journals mentioned in the previous chapter, then double back to describe the author (whose name heads the chapter), then double farther back to the date of his birth. Thus one comes with surprise upon the same event several times. The titles of the chapters indicate the nine "wallflowers": "Christopher North," "The Doctor" (William Maginn), "Ingoldsby," Harrison Ainsworth, John Forster, Wilkie Collins, Mrs. Henry Wood, "Lorna Doone" Blackmore, Ouida. The author fails to show us the technical development of popular fiction during this period. His critical dieta would be questioned by many readers. Is it true

that in *The woman in white* "Marian Halcombe, Mr. Fairlie, Sir Percival Glyde, and Mrs. Catherick are all vivid personalities"? His political comparisons are very superficial: "even modern Fascism found a parallel in the utilitarianism of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill" (after Waterloo in 1815—does he mean James Mill?). To young specialists the book will be of some value for its detailed account of minor figures and their journalistic background. It tells of the extension of the reading public, from "the gentry and professional class" who constituted the public when *Blackwood's* and *Fraser's* appeared, through "the new commercial class of prosperous shopkeepers, departmental managers, and office clerks" for whom Dickens established *Household words* in 1850, until "in the inevitable process of evolution, this class was in its turn supplanted as the widest reading public by the new mass of readers created by the introduction of free education, requiring a proportionately lower type of entertainment." Elwin sees this as the ironic fruition of the glorious hopes of those who thought they could improve the world by extending the amount of reading done without taking care to maintain the quality. In stamping out illiteracy, the press almost stamped out literature.

Malcolm Elwin's bias is exactly opposite to that of Miriam Thrall. He ends his book with an unfair comparison of the 1830's at their best with the 1930's at the average.

Then, twenty thousand people would pay half a crown for *Fraser* to read Maginn's attacks on Bulwer's novels; now, reviewers either write for a manual labourer's wage on weekly papers of infinitesimal circulation, or dish up a paragraph from a publisher's "blurb" under the direction of an editor's lady secretary. Then, Carlyle was regarded with reverence as a political thinker, the *Edinburgh review* was read for instruction, and *Blackwood* or *Fraser* for entertainment; now we have, in their places, respectively the B.B.C, the daily newspaper, and the Sunday newspapers. Ouida herself, with her cynical grimace, might well inquire, "What is progress?"

This "respectively" is very definite, but it is not true that the *Edinburgh* was read as a daily newspaper and *Fraser's* as a Sunday newspaper. A first-rate literary journalism is just as possible today as ever, and if we had better reviewers and scholars we would have better journals. It is not the fault of the public if university publications and professional works of criticism can be so lax in discussing the nineteenth century that Maginn and Carlyle are presented as leaders of progressive thought; Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill as fascists.

University of Iowa

JOSEPH E. BAKER

